CHAUCER'S 'MILLERES TALE.'

VARNHAGEN[1] was the first to observe that in this tale two different jests have been blended into one: (1) the jest of the man who let himself be scared by the prediction of a second flood, and (2) the story of the smith who, expecting to kiss his sweetheart's mouth, was made to kiss his rival's posteriors, on which he avenged himself with a red-hot iron from his smithy. The second jest alone is found as a separate story in Italian and French, just the very languages in which the tale as it is told by Chaucer, Hans Sachs[2] and Schumann, has not yet been traced. Its earliest occurrence is in the Novellino of Masuccio Salernitano (1476), where it stands as the twenty-ninth novel. The unknown collector of the *Contes du monde aventureux*, who signs himself A. D. S. D., borrowed the tale either from the Novellino or from the *Cento Novelli* (1561) of Sansovino, who probably took it from Masuccio. For other versions of what might be called the Masuccio type I may refer to Bolte's notes to his edition of Schumann's *Nachtbüchlein*[3].

I do not think that attention has ever been drawn to the fact that in this Masuccio type of the story the number of the nocturnal visitors is never less than three, with the sole exception of Brewer's jest[4]. But the latter also differs from the continental versions in that he makes the smith appear unexpectedly at the window, whereas all the other tales of the Masuccio type agree as to his appearing there by appointment. Both divergencies, together with the fact that this isolated form of the tale is found in England, make it very probable that Brewer retold the Masuccio story with the help of Chaucer's 'Milleres Tale.' He certainly did not follow Chaucer alone, for his smith proves his acquaintance with a more original form of the plot.

Was Chaucer the first to insert the episode of the man in the tub into this story of the smith's hapless love adventure? The assumption is

[1] *Anglia*, VII, Anzeiger, 81.

[2] 'Der schmit im pachdrog,' H. Sachs, *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke*, 3. Bd. in *Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des* XVI. *u.* XVII. *Jh.* 39—40.

[3] Lit. Ver., Stuttgart, 1893.

[4] See Proescholdt, *Anglia*, VII, 116.

not particularly convincing in the face of the sixteenth century versions of Sachs and Schumann, who, we may be sure, knew nothing of Chaucer. The missing link between the tale as it is told by these three and the story of the Masuccio type will have to be sought in France, although no trace of a *fabliau* based on this blended plot has as yet been discovered. But there exists a very interesting version of it in a Middle Dutch story, which constitutes a transitional form between Masuccio and Chaucer. This *fabliau*, or 'boerde' as it is called in Dutch, is found in the so-called Thorpe MS. of the Royal Library at Brussels, written, presumably, in the second half of the fourteenth century. The Flemish poet tells the story exactly as we know it from Masuccio, but he inserts the episode of the man in the tub. He agrees with the Italian novelist in the following three points, which have no counterpart in the tales of Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann: (1) The woman, whose name is Heile, receives three visitors in the same night at appointed hours. (2) The first of them is obliged to conceal himself at the arrival of the second visitor, a priest. (3) The smith is the next-door neighbour of the woman.

On the other hand, the Flemish poet agrees with Chaucer and the German versions in inserting the flood episode. But this insertion has been carried out in such a clumsy, awkward manner that even a negligent reader, who does not know the Masuccio version, is bound to discover its defects. Instead of hiding himself in the projecting part of the window (as in Masuccio), the first lover is told by Heile to climb into a tub which hangs down from the rafters. Not until his fear of being seen by the priest has driven him into this hiding-place comes the prediction of the flood to add to his agitation. For the priest, having done his business, treats the wench to a prophecy of the tremendous judgment of God, who would soon destroy the earth by water and fire. The other lover in his tub hears everything he says and, after long contemplation, arrives at the conclusion that the priest may be right, as the Gospel confirms his prediction. The events that follow do not differ materially from those in the other versions: the smith appears at the appointed hour; the priest plays his practical joke on him and is punished for it by the application of the hot iron. On hearing him cry for water, the man in the tub, believing the flood to be rising, cuts the ropes, and breaks an arm and a thighbone in his fall. The priest takes him for the devil and jumps aside, unfortunately into a latrine. So each of the three comes to harm for his dealings with the woman, and the poet concludes with a warning to all lechers.

The concealment motive of the Masuccio version is retained in the Middle Dutch 'boerde.' But the insertion of the flood motive required the substitution of the tub for the projecting window as a hiding-place. The possibility of a more thorough blending of the two motives forces itself upon even an indifferent reader of the 'boerde.' The originals of Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann must have been closely related versions of a considerably improved redaction of the story as preserved in the Middle Dutch 'boerde': the first visitor, who was foolish enough to take the priest's words for a serious prophecy, and the cry of 'water!' for a cry of despair at its actual fulfilment, such a man was a splendid figure for a cuckold, that favourite character of the medieval *fabliau.* So, in a later French redaction, the first visitor of the Flemish 'boerde' was transformed into the husband of the woman. But this alteration involved the loss of the hiding motive, for a husband would have no reason to conceal himself at the approach of his wife's lover. The priest's prediction, consequently, became the cause of the husband's sleeping in the tub. Nothing would have been more natural than to represent the prediction of the flood as an intentional lie, invented in order to get rid of the jealous husband. Schumann, however, has retained the original trait of the Flemish story and its supposed French original, that the prophecy is pronounced in good faith without any wicked intentions. For in his *Nachtbüchlein* the pastor who preaches the sermon and the nocturnal visitor of the merchant's wife are two different individuals. Schumann and the Flemish poet agree in yet another point, which does not occur in any other version: the priest of the 'boerde' predicts that 'God will destroy the world both with water and with fire,' and Schumann's rich merchant hears in church 'das der predicant saget, wie es zur zeyt des jüngsten tags wurde zugehen, das es da wurde feür regnen und verbrennen alles, was auff erden were, unnd was das feür wurde uber lassen, das wurde das wasser erseüffen.'

Our supposed French *fabliau* cannot have been an improved redaction of the Flemish poem, but must have been based upon the latter's French original. For in a few details Chaucer, Sachs and Schumann agree with the Masuccio story, whereas the Flemish poet states the facts under consideration in a slightly different way. The latter represents the woman as being unmarried and a common prostitute, differing therein from Masuccio, who calls her the wife of a well-to-do carpenter. The first nocturnal visitor is a merchant in Masuccio, a miller in the Middle Dutch story. It is possible that of our supposed French *fabliau* two versions existed side by side: one, in which the craft

of the original husband mentioned by Masuccio was attributed to the new husband into whom the first of the three visitors had been transformed; the other version representing him as a merchant, which he was before this transformation had been carried out. The former of these two hypothetical versions would have been the original of Chaucer's tale, in which silly John is called a carpenter; on the latter Schumann would have based his 'Schwank,' in which the husband is a merchant like Viola's first lover. Hans Sachs makes the husband a smith, in the German 'Schwankbücher' and in the Latin poem of Cropacius he is called a farmer.

The conclusion which I feel confident may be drawn from the above enquiry is this. The Middle Dutch 'boerde,' probably a translation of a French *fabliau*, represents the earliest and most original type of the blending of the flood motive with the story of the Masuccio type. The number of both Viola's and Heile's lovers is three and the episode of the first lover hiding himself at the approach of the second is common to the Italian novel and the 'boerde.' Of this type of the blended story, solely represented by the Flemish poem, a more artistic redaction must have existed, in which the first of the three lovers appeared as the woman's husband and, consequently, the hiding motive had been replaced by that of the new husband sleeping in the tub, for fear of a flood which he had heard a priest predict to his flock (source of Schumann). A still better revision identified the prophet with the lecherous priest, so that the husband's fear of being drowned was not a mere accident favourable to another man's wicked designs about his wife, but the wished for result of a well laid scheme (the source of Chaucer, Sachs, Cropacius, and the German 'Schwankbücher').

By thus assuming that the flood episode in the 'Milleres Tale' and in the German versions mentioned above developed out of the hiding motive in the Masuccio version, a satisfactory explanation is gained for the husband's otherwise unaccountable indifference about his wife's fate in the apprehended flood. Chaucer alone noticed this flaw in the plot: the three tubs of the 'Milleres Tale' are doubtless of his own invention, and by this he gave the finishing touch to this greatly altered story[1].

A. J. Barnouw.

The Hague.

[1] I am aware of the fact that in the tale of the South-Hungarian gipsies communicated by H. von Wlislocki in Koch's *Zs. f. vergl. Litteraturgesch.* N. F. II, 191, we possess another version in which three tubs are mentioned. But this tale seems to be ultimately based upon Chaucer's.

'ELEGY ON THE DEATH OF KING EDWARD I.'

From a new MS.

In a former communication (see Vol. VI, p. 455) I gave the text of the fragments of *Havelok* found in MS. 4407 (19) in the Cambridge University Library. With them are preserved three fragments of the 'Elegy on the Death of Edward I,' known hitherto from the copy preserved in MS. Harl. 2253 (fol. 73), printed in Wright's *Political Songs*, pp. 246—250, in Böddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen*, pp. 140—143, and in Percy's *Reliques of Ancient Poetry*, Series II, Book I. As these three prints are all from the same manuscript original, I presume that no other copy has hitherto been discovered.

Nevertheless, there was certainly once another copy, as we have here the fragments of it. I therefore give below a transcript of them. There are in all *three* fragments, on the scraps marked *a*, *b*, *c*. Of these, *a* contains ll. 6—12; *b*, ll. 20—29 (omitting l. 24); and *c*, ll. 83—88 (with four lines more). It ought to be observed that this English Elegy is a loose translation of a French Elegy of the same date (1307); the latter is printed in Wright's *Political Songs*, pp. 241—245.

(*a*) Of qwom þat god haued don is wille:
Me þenketh þat deþe haue don vs wrong,
þat he so sone schal liggen stille.

Engelond, þou aghtes wel to knowe
Of qwom þat I þis song schal singe;
Of oure king, þat lith so lowe,
þorgh alle þis word his name gan springe.

(*b*) I charde[1] ȝou deplike and sare
þat ȝe to engelon[d] ben trewe;
I deye, I may be king no mare,
Helpyt my sone, and corunnith hym newe.
[*Last line of stanza missing.*]

[1] *For* charge.

¶ I be-queþe myn herte wel rith, 25
It hathe ben wreten in my deing[1],
Ouer þe se þat it be dyth,
With seuenscore knigtes al of pris,
Of werre þat þei ben ware and wis. 29

(*c*) þe tende ne mith [I neuer telle], 83
þe godhed, wyt king[2] edwar (*sic*) was.
* Nou is he ded, allas! allas!
* God ȝiue his soule rest and ro!
* Seynt Edwar and saint Thomas,
* His huerde[3] bere ȝe þer-to.

¶ louerd, als he was conquerur 85
In ich a batayle, and hadde þe pris,
þou ȝeue his soule mechil onur,
And brinkyt[4] into heuene blis. 88

I add a few remarks. The insertion of 'þat' in l. 6 improves the metre. Ll. 9 and 10 are improvements. In l. 23, read 'Helpeth'; and 'crowneth'='crown'th.' L. 26 should be 'It hath ben writen in my deuis'; which seems better than the other version. In l. 27, this version has 'it,' i.e. my heart; the other version has 'hue,' i.e. 'she,' because 'herte' was feminine. Bishop Percy made the singular mistake of printing 'Hue' with a capital letter, as if it were a man's name, with the footnote:—'The name of the person who was to preside over this business.' In l. 28, the other copy has 'fourscore; but seuen score' is right. Warton, *Hist. of E. Poetry*, ed. Hazlitt, vol. II, p. 105, has:—'in his last moments he devoted the prodigious sum of thirty thousand pounds to provide *one hundred and forty knights*, who should carry his heart into Palestine.' It is interesting to find that this correction of the Elegy has the authority of our MS. In l. 83, I suppose 'þe tende' to mean 'the tenth part,' 'the tithe'; i.e. 'as to the goodness that was with king Edward, I could never recount the tithe of it.' The introduction of four new lines after l. 84 is curious; the word 'ro,' i.e. rest, is not very common. Ll. 85—88 are certainly better in this new copy.

Fragment (*g*) contains scraps of a poem unknown to me, but it is of no merit. I quote a stanza to show the metre.

[1] *An error for* deuis. [2] god; *with* king *written above it.*
[3] *With the* u *above, between* h *and* e, *for* huerte (heart).
[4] *For* bryng yt.

In þis werd þat hys so wicke
I ne mai no st[u]nde abide;
For mischances arne so þicke
And reueleke it be-tide;
Wylum haued I fere *and* flicke,
God hors on to ride;
Nou hys min hors a wrechyd sticke
þat stondit be my seyde (*sic*).

Note 'werd' for 'werld' (world); 'reueleke,' ruefully; after 'it' insert 'mot' (must) or something of the kind; 'wylum,' whilom; 'fere and flicke,' companion and lass.

The one gain here is the extremely rare word 'flicke,' of which no example is given either in Stratmann or in the *New English Dictionary*. It obviously represents the Swedish *flicka*, a girl, a lass.

Fragment (*h*), the eighth and last, gives us another MS. authority for the commencement of the *Proverbs of Hendyng*. Of this interesting poem I quote all that appears here. It most resembles the copy in MS. Harl. 2253. See Böddeker (as above), p. 287.

[*First line missing.*]
At wis hen[d]ing he may leren
þat was marcolfes sone;
Gode þankes and manie þeues
For to wissen oþere schrewes
þerto was euere hys wone. 6
[*First proverb omitted.*]
¶ Wyt and wysdum lerneþ ȝerne, 15
And loke þat noman oþir werne
To ben wis *and* hende.
For betere it were to ben wys
þan for to weren veir or gris,
Wer so man schal ende. 20
¶ Wyt and wysdom is gode warisun:
q[uod hendi]ng.
Ne may noman in his owen londe 23
For no þink þat he can fonde
Wone at hom *and* speden; 25
So feles þewes for to leren
So he þat haueth w[is?] *and* dere
...in fele þedom.

Also fele þedes, also fele þewes:
quod hen[d]ing.
Be þe schil ye euere so dere,
And it wele wantonnesse lere,
þou bet it oþir wile;
For if it mote haue alle is wille,
Wiltou niltou, it schal spille,
And become a file.

In l. 5, 'wissen' is a good reading. In l. 19, 'veir' is for 'vair,' a valuable fur; the Harl. MS. has 'foh.' In l. 28, 'þedom' is wrong; the plural of 'þede' is wanted. In l. 31, 'schil ye' is an error for 'child.' In l. 32, 'wantonnesse' is not so good as 'unþewes.' The last word 'file' corrects the reading 'fule' in the Harl. MS.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE ITALIAN SOURCES OF DANIEL'S 'DELIA.'

I PROPOSE in the following note to make various additions and corrections to what has already been written concerning the Italian sources of Daniel's *Delia*[1]. It has so far escaped attention that Sonnet XXVII of *Delia*, which first appeared in the edition of 1594, is an adaptation and amplification in a different form of the following Italian madrigal, as appears at once from a comparison of the two compositions:

Oft do I marvel, whether Delia's eyes
Are eyes, or else two radiant stars that shine?
For how could Nature ever thus devise
Of earth, on earth, a substance so divine?
Stars, sure, they are! Whose motions rule desires;
And calm and tempest follow their aspects:
Their sweet appearing still such power inspires,
That makes the world admire so strange effects.
Yet whether fixed or wandering stars are they,
Whose influence rules the Orb of my poor heart?
Fixed, sure, are they! But wandering, make me stray
In endless errors; whence I cannot part.
Stars, then, not eyes! Move you, with milder view,
Your sweet aspect on him that honours you!

Camilla Bella

Dialogo

Amante, & Amore.

Ama. Deh dimmi Amor se gli occhi di Camilla
Son occhi, ò pur due stelle?
Amo. Sciocco, non hà possanza
Natura, à cui virtute il ciel prescrisse,
Di far luci si belle.
Ama. Son elle erranti ò fisse?
Amo. Fisse, ma de gli amanti
Fan gir (no'l proui tù) l' anime erranti.

Now the Italian piece just quoted appears in the *Rime del molto illustre signor Caualiere Battista Guarini...* Venetia, 1598, p. 117, the

[1] See Josef Guggenheim, *Quellenstudien zu Samuel Daniels Sonettencyclus 'Delia'* (Berlin Thesis), Berlin, 1898; H. Isaac (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, XVII, 181 et seq.): 'Wie weit geht die Abhängigkeit Shakespeare's von Daniel als Lyriker.'

first and only edition in collected form of Guarini's *Rime* in the sixteenth century. Some of his compositions, thirty-six sonnets and one madrigal, appeared as early as 1567 in the *Rime degli academici Eterei* (Padua), and others, fifty madrigals, in the *Rime di diversi celebri poeti dell' età nostra* (Bergamo, 1587), published and collected by G. B. Licino. The madrigal in question figures in Licino's anthology, but is there attributed not to Guarini, but to Torquato Tasso. Despite this, it appears to belong to Guarini (though Daniel need not necessarily have thought so), as the edition of 1598 of the *Rime* having been personally supervised by the author of the *Pastor Fido* would hardly have been made to include a piece that was not his own property. Daniel may have come across it in one of the numerous collections of Italian madrigals set to music issued in the sixteenth century, in which the compilers were not very particular in their attribution of the pieces. The most likely solution, however, is that Daniel, who seems to have known Guarini personally (we may safely conclude so from Daniel's commendatory sonnet to the Dymmocke translation of the *Pastor Fido*), heard the madrigal sung in Guarini's house, or had it communicated to him in some other way by Guarini at the time of his visit to Italy, undertaken probably before 1590. Personal relations with Guarini must have acted as an incentive to know his poems, and no doubt directed Daniel's attention to Guarini rather than to Tasso when the author of *Delia* subsequently tried his hand at the pastoral.

The influence of Guarini's *Rime* is also present in Sonnet XLII of *Delia*, which is fashioned on the pattern of the eighteenth sonnet of Daniel's Italian contemporary, and clearly reechoes the final conceit:

> e come
> Puo in odio hauer celeste immortal Dea
> Quel Tempio, ove s' adora il suo bel nome?

in the lines:

> Thus ruins She, to satisfy her will,
> The Temple where her name was honoured still.

Although Daniel preferred Guarini to Tasso as a model for pastoral poetry, he drew much more largely on the latter for his *Delia* sonnet-cycle. As early as 1882 H. Isaac (*op. cit.* p. 181) showed that the three sonnets (XXXIII, XXXVI, XXXVII) in which Daniel prophetically describes the havoc that old age will make upon his mistress's beauty faithfully reproduce, in spite of a few divergencies, the three sonnets of the *Rime amorose* (LVI, LVII, LVIII) in which the Italian poet attempts the same task. Mr Sidney Lee is accordingly in error when he here points

(Introduction to *Elizabethan Sonnets*, p. liv) to Ronsard as the model, although he is on the right track when he adds that 'there is a likelihood that Daniel was better read in the later Italian poetry which was produced in his own lifetime than in the Italian poetry of Petrarch,' and instances in support of his statement the piece entitled 'A Pastorall' which first appeared in the 1592 edition of *Delia* and turns out to be a literal rendering of the famous 'choro' in Tasso's *Aminta* ('O bella età de l' oro'). Whilst on the subject of Daniel's indebtedness to Tasso[1] it may be pointed out that Sonnet XXXIV of *Delia* is composed on the pattern of a passage of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* (c. XVI, 14 and 15).

The imitative habit of Daniel's sonneteering muse is further illustrated by Sonnet XXX ('And yet, I cannot reprehend the flight'), which is an adaptation of Tansillo's famous 'Amor m' impenna l' ale e tanto in alto.' In *Delia* LIV ('Unhappy pen! and ill-accepted papers!') the original is Angelo di Costanzo[2] ('Penna infelice, e mal gradito ingegno'), but the immediate model appears to have been Desportes (*Cléonice*, LVIII), with whom the Neapolitan was a particular favourite. A comparison of the closing lines in the three compositions makes this point clear, I think:

E perchè ancor di cio non si lamenti,
E ver noi più s' inasprì, abbiate cura
Che fuor non esca il suon de i mesti accenti.
Si che queste al mio mal pietose mura
Ai parti vostri, e a' miei sospiri ardenti
Sieno in un tempo culla e sepoltura.

Encor, pour n'irriter cette fière déesse,
La nuict, seul à mon lict, j'ouvriray ma tristesse,
Escrivant et tirant de mes yeux maint ruisseau;
Et ce lict, seul témoin de mes maux incurables,
Sera de tant d'escrits, mes enfans misérables,
Tout en un même tans la tombe et le berceau.

But since she scorns her own; this rests for me.
I'll moan, myself; and hide the wrong I have:
And so content me, that her frowns should be
To m' infant style, the cradle and the grave.

Desportes' 'escrits—mes enfans' is obviously reflected in Daniel's 'm' infant style' for which there is no equivalent in Costanzo's version.

[1] It may be remarked incidentally, and as germane to the general question, that the credit of having first detected the influence of Tasso on Spenser's *Amoretti* belongs to E. Koeppel (*Anglia*, XI, 36), and that consequently Fitzmaurice-Kelly's 'Note on three sonnets' (*Revue hispanique*, XII, 259, and XIII, 257) requires correction in that particular.

[2] Another imitation of A. di Costanzo (whose sonnets by the way did not appear in collected form during the sixteenth cent.) is to be found in Sonnet X of the Fifth Decade of the *Diana* of Constable (and others)—'Prometheus for stealing living fire,' which corresponds closely to Costanzo's 'Del foco che dal ciel Prometeo tolse.' In this case the imitation is direct.

In the same way certain verbal resemblances prove that Sonnet XXXIII of *Delia*, already mentioned ('I once may see, when years may wreck my wrong'), was not written without a knowledge of Desportes' adaptation (*Cléonice* LXII) of Tasso's version. These and other examples of the same kind go to strengthen Sidney Lee's view, which I share, that in general the Elizabethan sonneteers were more intimately acquainted with French than with Italian literature, and not infrequently worked on French renderings of Italian sonnets. Even Spenser, whose wide and accurate knowledge of Italian literature appears undoubted, did not despise Desportes.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

AN ANGLO-FRENCH LIFE OF SAINT OSITH[1].

Declension.

§ 43. Nouns.

We shall consider first of all the masculine nouns and shall place in a first paragraph (i) correct forms assured by the rime; in a second (ii) such forms as are rendered certain by the scansion or are correct in orthography; in a third (iii) those which may be easily altered without any detriment to rime or scansion; and in a fourth (iv) such as are proved incorrect by rime or scansion.

i. (*a*) Nom. sing. *guez* (: *passez*) 603; *sire* (: *desire*) 445; *li reis* (: *meis*) 625, (: *Engleis*) 131, 140.

(*b*) Acc. sing. *barun* (: *non*) 743; *seigniur* (: *creatur*) 4.

(*c*) Nom. pl. *ordiné* (: *entré*) 1251; *pasturel* (: *mantel*) 332; also *païsant* 185, *seigniur* 1269, *sergant* 1549, *parent* 379, *barun* 582.

(*d*) Acc. pl. *chiviaus* (: *beaus*) 26; also *ordenez* 659, *sëus* 562 etc.

ii. (*a*) Nom. sing. *li cerfs* 558, 581, 584; *li fous* 1342; *li paens* 140; *li pauteners* 1399; *li seneschals* 1399, 1551; *li sacrestains* 1110; *hom* 181, 586, 717, 1130 etc.; *li reis* 61, 444, 475 etc.; *li marbre* 912; *li gages* 1634.

(*b*) Acc. sing. *le cerf* 580; *creatur* 3; *mund* 15; *ivern* 267; *faucon* 1040; *barun* 483; *conte* 743; *sanc* 142; *home* 180, 1558 etc. etc.

(*c*) Nom. pl. *li chanoine* 1198, 1269 (final *e* elided); *li chien* 567 etc.; *li brachet* 565; *li paen* 802; *li seigniur* 1293.

(*d*) Acc. pl. *chivalers* 395, 489; *seinz* 38; *enfanz* 141 etc.

iii. Add sign of nom. sing. to *fet* and *defet* 707—8, change *les chanoines* to *li chanoine* 1483; omit *s* of *compaignons* and in line 962 change *ses nons* to *sun non*; the change seems authorised by the fact that the adjective is in the nom. pl.

iv. (*a*) Acc. for nom. *peil* (: *veil*) 689; *vent* (: *-ment*) 1038; *compaignon* (: *non*) 420. There is some excuse for this violation of the rule for *peil*; the ending *-eil* is rare in Old French and has been

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. VII, No. 1 (p. 93).

replaced except in *peil* > *poil* while *veil* has early disappeared (it is retained in English). Other words *feeils* < fidelis, *chameils* < camelus have undergone suffix change, cf. Suchier § 65.

(*b*) Acc. pl. for nom. *peres* : *meres* 23.

We may add a few indeclinable nouns: *sëus* (< segusius) 248; *mes* 318; *sens* 248; *cors* 348.

It may be said then that the author is surprisingly accurate in his use of the Old French declension. There are of course numbers of words which might be corrected and to which no reference has been made, they may well be attributed to the scribe; such are *colum*[s] 1040; *li seneschal*[s] 1611; *li cerf*[s] 588 etc. etc. It does not seem plain whether *finement* (: *prent*) 37 is an infraction or not, there is no other instance of a Latin neuter in *-ment* in our text. The forms *ancestres* 22, *prestres* 417[1] as well as *compaingnon* 420 can hardly be considered as incorrect for Agn., the first and the last appear with the single form for both cases already in the Oxford MS. of the *Roland*. There is only one instance (l. 1377) of an infinitive used as a noun in the nominative case in rime and it is without *s*, the same archaism is found in the *Comput* 985, 2791; the scribe has added an *s* in l. 942; for other cases see ll. 413, 618, 715, 1192.

There is little to remark about proper names; none appear in the nominative case in rime except *Editz* (: *diz*) 233. This is one of those poetic licences with names so common in Gaimar. For nouns of the Latin third and fifth declensions it seems impossible to say whether they take an *s* or not. There is little to be said of feminine nouns. In Old French there are few feminine nouns belonging to the class with varying stress. From sóror, sorórem we have nom. *suer*, acc. *serour*, pl. *serours*, but owing to the frequent use of the form *suer* as a nominative of address, *serour* is early lost and a new pl. *suers* even formed. As early as the *Roland suer* (l. 294) in the accusative is found in an *ué* assonanced tirade. Further *serour* is found as a nominative and even with an added *s*. Similarly are treated words denoting persons having a nom. in *-e* and an acc. in *-ain* as *none, nonain*. Our text seems to offer instances of these changes. Thus in l. 223 the rime with *amur* seems to indicate that the form *seur* should be changed to *serur*; it would have the further advantage of correcting the scansion; while in l. 242 the form *serur* is assured by the rime with *ducur* and *ele* may very properly count as one syllable only; cf. § 5 ii (*β*). The form *serur*

[1] Another reading is suggested in § 44 A iii. In Adgar we find *proveire* as nom. (: *aneire*) 10. 36 and as acc. 13. 56.

seems particularly suitable as it is a later form and these lines are in (B). In ll. 1095, 1217, 1229 *suer* (notice the older spelling) is correct, while in l. 1220 the adoption of the form *seror* would enable one to alter the incorrect *porte* (cf. § 55 i) and would bring the accented final syllable *serúr* into what we may assume was its position intended by the poet, viz. the fourth syllable. In l. 371 we have *nonain* as nominative. In our text the oblique case can still be used in a limited sense for the genitive, particularly in such stock expressions as *la Deu ancele* 49, 635; *les seinz Deu* 38; *Deu enemis* 963; *pur Deu amur* 40, 660; also before proper names as *le jur Seint Michel* 1105; and when the genitive expresses a person, *les plaiz l'evesque* 1458, 1470.

There is little to remark as to gender. *Honur* would seem to be feminine but the evidence of the adjective *trespassable* (: *estable*) 17 is unconvincing. *Fiertre* appears both as masculine and feminine 1491, 1495; in the only other case that I have met it in Agn. (*St Richard* 1639) it is masculine; by analogy probably with *châsse* it became and remains feminine.

§ 44. Adjectives.

The adjectives may be treated in the same way as the nouns and divided into (i) such forms of adjectives and past participles as are correct judged by rime and scansion; (ii) such as may be considered correct from scansion and orthography; (iii) such as may be corrected without detriment to scansion or rime; and (iv) such as are proved incorrect by rime or scansion.

A. Masculines.

i. (*a*) Nom. sing. *-ez* < *-atus*, *iz* < *-itus*, *-uz* < *-utus* are assured by the following rimes: *aprestez* (: *entendez*) 29; *passez* (: *guez*) 604; *evaniz* (: *partiz*) 622; *restuz* (: *venuz*) 615; and also in the following: 493, 720, 912, 987, 1351, 1352, 1403, 1404, 1553, 1554, 1621, 1649, 1650.

(*b*) The nom. pl. without flexional *s* is assured by the following rimes: *alé* (: *trespassé*) 31; *lé* (: *mangé*) 491; *avenu* (: *vertu*) 82; *grant* (: *siwant*) 567; *seur* (: *jur*) 864; also the ll. 115, 207, 607, 623, 769, 792, 885, 888, 939, 941, 954, 1010, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1050, 1057, 1083, 1084, 1236, 1340, 1381, 1382, 1484.

ii. (*a*) Nom. sing. *fols* 20; *bons* 37; *gariz* 1635.

(*b*) Nom. pl. *luintain* 187; *lé* 379; *venu* 767; also 956, 1168, 1257, 1484, 1512.

iii. The following could easily be corrected:

bon 2; *fort* 61, 279; *amé* 79; *seint* 138; *lung* 275; *blanc* 558;

venu 548, 584; *conissant* 970; *contenu* 1371; *sein* 1534: the lines 417—8 might be emended *Proveire esteient ordiné, E seint evesque puis sacré.*

iv. The following are incorrect according to rime or scansion:

Nom. sing. *puissant* (: *refusant*) 61, 673; *fort* (: *port*) 609; *restif* (: *belif*) 950; and also 100, 963, 983, 1346, 1546 and in (B) *parfund* (: *punt*) 277; *bruiant* (: *despant*) 279.

After a neuter subject, whether expressed or not, the attributive adjective is normally neuter, i.e. without flexional *s*, in Old French, but the feeling for the neuter is too vague for this to be an invariable rule; the masculine is often found (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire historique*, I, p. 223 C). The neuter seems to be preferred in Agn., e.g. *Bestiaire*: *E cuvenable esteit* 71 etc.; Gaimar:...*pur ço est dit* (: *murdrit*) 4053; *ço est dreit* (: *esteit*) 5112 etc.; Adgar: *ceo n'est dreit* (: *toleit*) 8. 133; *St Gilles*: *il es dreit* 2091. The examples for our text are in lines 58, 851 (cf. § 59), 1369.

B. Feminines.

Taking the feminine adjectives and participles in the same order there are few infractions of the ordinary rules of declension.

i. The adjectives in *-abilis* are correctly *trespassable* : *estable* 17; *grant* (: *tant*) 536; : *aparissant* 819; other lines showing correct forms are: 69, 73, 127, 170, 362, 363, 367, 368, 387, 421, 439, 443, 462, 797, 810, 826, 1117, 1167, 1215, 1262, 1375, 1389, 1411, 1651.

ii. The existence of forms as *grant* is assured by scansion in ll. 138, 806, 1063 and *lasse* by ll. 1166, 1224.

iii. Changes could be made without detriment to the text in: *granz* 16, *mené* 377; also in ll. 464—5, 651, 829, 1106, 1167.

iv. Except for *tele* (already common in the twelfth century) all the infractions are found in (B), e.g. *repairé* 231; *remansu* 268; *irascu* 312.

§ 45. Agreement of the past participle.

The rule for the agreement of the past participle when the object precedes is observed in the following cases assured by the rime: 444, 481, 678, 809, 1118, 1201, 1202, 1222 and with the object following in line 421. (This may be *because* of the rime.)

The rule is broken in the following cases in rime: 148, 688, 1513, 1514, 1516 and in (B) 285, 288. Lines 200 *apris*[*e*] and 719 *fet*[*e*] could be so emended.

The non-observance is sometimes convenient especially in (B) and (A) as rimes otherwise impossible are thereby secured, e.g. 1513—4. This is common in thirteenth century Agn. poems, cf. *St Richard* § 50.

§ 46. The past participle with reflexive verbs.

Only one case of agreement of the participle with the subject in the masculine seems to occur in rime: *s'est partiz* 621; but there are a large number of feminines, e.g. 269, 302, 409, 440, 709, 829, 1133, 1136, 1258. There are other cases correct in the interior of the line, e.g. 617, while many others could be emended by the simple addition of [*z*]; e.g. 496, 570, 978, 1359; one case only of non-agreement seems assured by the rime, viz. 1325.

§ 47. Adjective.

A. Possessive (possessive pronouns are also included).

The ordinary weak forms are all found and the following alone are noteworthy: *si* (nom. pl.) 1529; *le men* 982; *le mien* 437; *la sue* 505; *un lur* 1321; *les seens* 1542.

B. Demonstrative and indefinite.

Our text has nom. sing. *cil* 140, 512 and *cist* 1441 side by side with *icest* 1160 and *cest* 1090. The correct forms are doubtless those of the poet but none of them appear in rime. *Cist* is found in line 582 as nom. pl.; the acc. pl. is *ces*; we may notice also *cil autre* as nom. pl. 930; *itel* and *tel* as feminines 928, 1024, and the use of the definite article with these adjectives as *des ces* 763. For the indefinite we note *aukes de...*231, 448 etc.

§ 48. Pronouns—personal and reflexive.

The strong-accented forms of the personal pronoun are found:

i. After prepositions: *par mei* 244; *pur li* (masc.) 58; *a ly* 497; *a li* (fem.) 244; *pur lui* (fem.) 196; *ou li* (fem.) in rime with *ci* 806; also ll. 670, 1165, 997, 149.

ii. Before an infinitive: *sei fere* 965, also 530, 534, 641, 1168; further after an infinitive: *pur prendre sei* 721.

iii. After an indicative: *purpense sei* 721; also the weak form: *e traveillent se* which should perhaps be emended to *sei* 1193. (Cf. *Bestiaire: Deus la furmat e concut lui* 3105.)

iv. After a past part. and before a finite: *E estrussé li ad...*1111.

v. As a disjunctive: *li = elle,* cf. ll. 282, 361, 636, 800.

vi. With reflexive verbs instead of *sei* as *de li mover* 1070.

It is doubtful whether this form may be used before a finite verb. The Agn. MS. of *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* 991 has *e li turna vers Orient* but this may be an incorrect reading, although it turns accurately the Latin: *ad Orientem conversa*; the continental versions have *ele garda* or *esgarda.*

The pronoun *ele* has often the syllabic value of *el'*, e.g. 312, 319, 1246 and is sometimes so written, but oftener not.

All the weak forms are found, *li* seems to be the usual form for both masculine and feminine; *lui* only appears once, line 196. The pronoun *en* appears in its modern use in line 387 and also in its Old French sense of 'in the matter,' e.g. 714, 998. In line 272 *u* = *à laquelle* and in line 694 *i* = *li* (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire historique*, I, p. 226, *Bestiaire*: *Quant diable at tempté Saint ume e espruvé Ne mal n'i pot truver*, 1167—9 Jordan Fautosme: *Fors la cité de Lundres, u nul ne set sa per*, *Chronique* 912 and *Modwenna*: *A tele vus cumanderai, U jeo tres bien m'afierai* 527—8). The *i* of *li* is elided in line 286 (B), cf. *St Richard* § 52.

The syntax of the pronoun in our poem is no longer that of the oldest texts; whereas any of the pronouns may be omitted as subjects, all may be used. There is probably a slight difference, thus in ll. 1143, 1145, 1146 there is some stress implied by the sense which is quite absent in ll. 1147, 1149, 1150. Instances of omission are very numerous, e.g. ll. 660, 757—60, 917, 1004, 1100, 1141, 1175; instances of use 661—2, 968, 1327 etc. There is a good instance of a strong use of *il* in line 686 and of *il* as disjunctive in 493.

There are two cases which may be discussed separately. In ll. 698 and 1108 we find the weak forms of the pronoun used after an infinitive and the infinitives are complemental depending on a preposition. The common usage here is to employ the strong form which should precede the infinitive. In the first of these two cases the pronoun is perhaps spurious, the line has a syllable too many and that in a portion of the poem where the scansion is on the whole accurate; it may have been introduced from the following line; further the MS. has a sign ? which is employed elsewhere to indicate a pause in the sense, e.g. l. 752 after *servir*. We propose to emend by omitting the *la*. In the second case the position may be due to the desire of the poet to avoid hiatus of the final *e* of *faire* with initial *i* of *iluec*. To explain the use of the weak form the poet may have had in mind another construction, viz. the use of the weak form with a finite verb having an infinitive complement; this form would, and generally did even till the seventeenth century, precede the finite verb but it might immediately precede the infinitive; thus in the *Bestiaire* in two consecutive lines we have an example of each construction: *Nel volent esculter, Volent le desturber* 1715—6.

The use of the pronoun after the infinitive is a peculiarity of N.W. texts. According to Rydberg, *o.c.* pp. 587—95, it is confined to those

districts that to-day form the départements of Eure, Seine inférieure, Calvados, Manche and Seine et Oise, i.e. nearly all Normandy and a part of Ile de France. It is natural therefore to find cases in Anglo-French works. Rydberg quotes a large number of instances but in most of these the strong form of the pronoun is preferred.

The use of the weak form of the pronoun after a finite verb seems to be rare: I can only find in my notes two instances, viz. *Tristan* of Béroul *laidissent la* 775; and *Roman de Troie*: *Honora les de grant maniere*, 1204.

§ 48 *a*. The pronoun with reflexive verbs.

Whereas in Old French the number of reflexive verbs was greatly increased by the inclusion of verbs that were intransitive in Latin, there was a tendency to omit the reflexive pronoun and to render the verb intransitive; this was specially the case with the present participle and the infinitive. Numerous examples are quoted by Brunot, *op. cit.* p. 237; our text offers examples in ll. 939, 1425—7. The verb which seems to have most easily dispensed with the pronoun is *se lever*; our poem offers the following instances: *Bien leva devant* (corr. *ainz*?) *le chant de gal* 306: *Et par matin est tost levé* 1359; *E cele est par matin levée* 1411. Examples are very numerous; thus: *Bestiaire*: *Kar se culchiez esteit* (the elephant) *Par sei ne levereit* 1545—6. Examples do not seem very plentiful in Gaimar[1] or Adgar[2] but *St Gilles* contains many, e.g. *Par la cité leve le cri* 753; *le soleil leve* 916, also 2739, 1379, but *Il s'en levat* 622. *Sainte Marie* has similar cases and so too Marie de France: *Li chevaliers cuntre els leva* (*Guigemar* 769 and *ibidem* 673, 869 and *Deuz Amanz* 214), also *Haveloc* 708 *Le cri lieve en la cité*; *ibid.* 903 *Haveloc est levé en piez.* In the *Roland* we find *Isnelement sur lor piez releverent* 3575 and Crestien de Troyes, *Erec*: *Quant a lor eise orent sopé Et des tables furent levé*...501—2. There is a full discussion of this phenomenon as far as the seventeenth century is concerned in §§ 60—61 of Haase, *Syntaxe française du xvii*[e] *siècle.*

§ 49. Pronouns—relative and interrogative.

The scribe prefers the spellings with initial *k*; we have many instances of *ki* or *ky*, e.g. 2, 39, 101 etc. but very frequently *ke* stands for the nominative; this form must often be due to the poet since this

[1] I remember no case with *lever* but we find *Quand il turnad de la cuntrée* (cf. ll. 3675, 4013), compare with *Cil s'en turnad* 4513 (cf. 4237).

[2] I can only recall *Establi a sei itel us Que chaune nuit leva sus, Si ala puis en cel mustier* 18. 31—3.

e is elided with the following vowel, e.g. 1317, 1375 (not elided 1092); *ki* may stand for older *cui* 112, 830. The poet uses the relative *que* in the feminine 805 but this may be only a spelling and of no importance. The neuter is *ke* 1141 and also *kei* 312, 319. Note too *ceo que* 406 referring to a phrase.

§ 50. Pronoun—demonstrative.

The forms are fairly correct: nom. sing. *cil* 9, 12, 453, 1171; incorrect *cel* 237 (B); nom. pl. *cil* 1043, 1047, 1123, 1455; acc. pl. *ceus* 21; fem. *cele* 1177. The poet is fond of the longer form *icest* which is twice in rime 544, 730. We have also *cesti* as acc. 626 and *ceo* is common; for the compound demonstrative we have *ly qui* 569.

§ 51. Pronoun—indefinite.

The following forms occur: *l'em* 94, 164; *l'en* 372; *l'un* 955 but regularly (cf. § 42) *li un...li autre* 542; *les autres* 919; *chescun* (never with *s*) 926 etc., with verb in pl. 1028; *aucun* 1173; *plusurs* 187 as nom. pl. in (B) but not assured; for Latin totus the forms vary but the nom. pl. *tuit* is in rime with *bruit* 999; *amdeuz* and *amedeuz* occur in (B) 288, 341; *tele* 55 assured by scansion; *mult de* 1299 and *aukes de* are common.

§ 52. Adverbs.

The adverbs are well represented in our text: *petit* 165 together with *poi* 18; *aval* and *amunt* 869; *sus e jus* 624; *guerres* 67 and *gueres* in the sense of nothing 680; *leus* 323 (a form also found in the Corpus MS. of *Sainte Marie*); *meuz* (= plutôt) 1365; *a plein* (cf. § 14) and the Agn. form *sovente feiz* (cf. § 59). As adverbial complement we may note *mot ne sona* 903. An interesting word is *enteins* (cf. § 59). The adverbs in *-ment* are mostly in the older and correct forms as: *comunaument* 804; *cruelment* 796, 807, 986; *delivrement* 556; *erranment* 986; *estrussement* 499 (this adverb is derived from *estrossé* and should therefore be *estrosséement*, such seems to be the form in *Erec* 5592); *forment* 507; *leaument* (not *lelment* as often in Agn.) 835. *Dreit* and *tut dreit* are found but not abusively as is often the case in Agn. (cf. *St Richard* § 57); *tut* and *trestut* are common 558, 658, 606 and so too are *a tut* 780 and *del tut* 829, 864. Note too *aukes* 887.

§ 53. Conjunction.

The question of the conjunction in our poem is almost exclusively the syntax of *que* as few compound conjunctions are to be found in it;

si is still used though sparingly for *et*, e.g. 119[1], 527 and also *ne* 168 but *si* is already for *if* at least for the scribe. The syntax of *que* is one of the most interesting chapters of Old French grammar[2]; we shall endeavour to sum it up as concisely as possible, adding too the examples where no *que* appears.

I. With verbs denoting intellectual activity.

i. knowing, believing.

A. With the indicative in the dependent clause.

Sachez ke la pucele...*esteit* bele 169; cf. 1663.

Purpensa sey...ke rien ne *valut* sa dolur 721; cf. 895, 897.

With infinitive: *Cuida* son livre *aver receu* 287 (B).

No *que*: Tres bien *savez*, Vers Dampnedeu mespris *avez* 1561.

Quide (ke) deable l'en *a* traï 696.

B. With the subjunctive.

Sin *crei*...ke seinte Osith gré le *sauvast* 119—20 (cf. § 59).

Lors ke *neée fust suscherent* 239.

Ke *conisant seit*...ke...ne *seum*...perilié 970—2.

ii. perceiving.

A. Quant la dame *entent* Ke ne *volent* faire nient 663—4, also 1279.

Quant cil *veient* ke n'*ad* mestier 951, also 723, 1602.

Bien...*ad aparceu* K'ele *fu* dolente 311.

No *que*: Kant *veit* ne *puet* estre muée 723, also 1588.

B. *Entendez*...ke en *puissez* aver aïe 123.

S'il *veit* ke el estre ne *peust* 727.

iii. declaring.

A. *Dirrez* (ke) granz biens i *puet* trover 245, also 250, 304, 631, 1418.

E...*voé unt* Ke chescun *ferunt* porter 1027.

Il *resona* ke a lui se *vout*...468, also 469.

No *que*: Bien l'*os* dire, fols *est* pur veir 20, also 499—500, 515, 703, 707.

Ceo signe (ke) de joie *volent* trere 1496.

B. Ke dunc *fust* nonein ne *di* pas 371.

Unk cele nef *ne fist samblant* k'en ewe *fust*...921.

iv. Impersonal verbs.

A. Un jour *aveneit*...que Modwen *aleit* 825.

[1] 119. In this line the *si en* of the MS. is to be read *sin*.

[2] We shall follow throughout the able statement of its importance as contained in Mr Ritchie's *Recherches sur la syntaxe de la conjonction 'que' dans l'ancien français*, Paris 1907.

Acune feiz *avint*...ke grant tempeste *out*...859.

Ke *deit* ke nostre nef ne *vait*? 934, cf. § 59.

B. When the principal clause is negative or hypothetical the mood is the subjunctive; there are no cases of this in our text.

II. With verbs denoting emotion.

A. Old and Middle French prefer the indicative mood and we find: Molt *se merveille* que ge *puis* tant targier (*Cour. de Louis* 1108) and Je *regrette* de tout mon cueur que n'*est* icy Picrochole (Rabelais). Anglo-Norman, however, seems to prefer the subjunctive though some instances of the indicative are to be found, e.g. *C'est merveille* ke jo m'en *tais* (*St Gilles* 116), also *ibidem* 245, 2877 and *Ce peise* mei ke jo *sui* vive (*Ste Marie* 414). Our text offers no instances of the indicative.

B. Edith *s'est emerveilliée* Ke *fëist* Osith tant targer 302.

Li chanoine s'*en vunt plaindre* a Deu...Ke *seit* eus vengant 1483.

Pur *estre grevé* Ke de havene *seient* jeté 939.

N'*estut doter* Quel jur *deive* del siecle aler 35.

III. With verbs denoting volition.

i. will, command, prayer, obligation.

A. The only case of the indicative is one in which no *que* occurs.

Tant *a requis*...Le dreit chemin li *unt* mustré 1188.

B. Jeo *voil* ke le veil me *donez* 645.

A seinte Osith *a graanté* Ke *remaine* tut autresi 723, also 1294.

Suffrir ne vout K'ele *seit* al mustier 1112, also 1505.

Deu *a purvueu* issi Ke guerisun *eies* 1153.

Comandent...K'il *augent* tut a avirons 935.

Covient...Deu *prier* K'il nus *pardoint* icel pechié 1008.

Covent ke jeo *meste* mun don 736.

So also with *demander* 1184; *orer* 120; *crier* 1127, 1232; *reclamer* 584; *requerre* 176, 403, 659, 1143, 1296, 1386, 1620; *conseillier* 208 and less usual phrases as *crier merci ke*...471; *metre en preres ke* 341—4; *prendre penitance ke*...966; *estre en aïe ke*...1685.

No *que*: Deu unt *requis*...Mes ne *seient* en tel baillie 1024, also 403—7.

ii. preventing, forbidding.

1. Requert Deu li *purgart*...ke ne *perde* 407.
2. *Metrai mon poer* Ke ne *seie*...hunie 437.
3. A seinte Osith ne *puet hom mesfaire* K'ele n'*enprenge* 1571.
4. Comanda aler...pur *veer* Ke a Chic [ne] *deusent* poseer 1453.

The use of *ne* seems absolute and as it occurs in exs. 1, 2, 3 I add it in 4 also.

The indicative is sometimes found when a resolution is expressed: Puis ceste hure *mettrai...Tute ma force*...ke mes travail n'*avrez* ll. 531—3.

IV. The co-relative.

The use of the co-relative is not frequent in our text; *ço* is by far the commonest: *Ceo* demander serreit folie 322; Mes tut seez *de ceo* seur ke...1664, or adverbial expressions as L'alme del cors *pur poi* n'en ist 691.

V. *Que* consecutive: *que* = *si bien que.*

A. Et par les gerrons...*prist* Son mantel ke le livre *obli* 282—4.

Et *travaillient* sei...ke *venu i sunt* 1193

and with the expressions *si ke, si cum, tel ke, tant ke...*

La contraite...plure *si ke* noiant *esteit* escuter 1242.

Ele prend *tel* vengement *ke*...bien *parra*...1573.

Tant veit *k'*al muster *est* venue 810, also 1213, 1224, 1326.

No *que*: Seinte Osith l'a *si* forment mis...Ne *puet*...plus estre ostez 1347—51.

If the result is positive, the verb is in the indicative.

VI. *Que* final. (The verb is always in the subjunctive.)

Modwen a Edith Osith *enveia* Ke bien la *preist*...227.

Le liu Nonnepol *est apellé* Ke ja mes en siecle ne *seit* celé 370, also 363.

The so-called optative use can be included here; with and without *que.*

Amis *ke* Deu vus *doint* sauveté 327.

Seinte Osith nus *seit* en aïe...1685.

Deu *penst* de mei par sa merci 666.

VII. *Que* causal.

i. que = weakened *car.*

Ke Deu ama e Deu servi 57. This use is uncommon in our text and in the example here quoted Ke might conceivably = *qui.*

ii. *que* = puisque.

Only in the phrase *quant est issi* where *quant* replaces *que* 665, 729, cf. § 59.

iii. *que* with interjections (the ordinary tense is the pres. indic.).

Allas, ke il ne *set* icest 544.

Ha Deus ke Edith ne *seust* l'aventure. (This is possibly corrupt and should read: *Deus*! k'Edith ne *sot*...but the subjunctive might stand though it is very rare[1], for the scansion in that case see § 5 ii (ζ).)

[1] Mr Ritchie *l.c.* p. 74 quotes only two cases of the past subjunctive and very few of the past indicative.

VIII. *Que* temporal.

i. With expressions of time (*que* is here often replaced by *quant*).

En icel tens ke cil veneient 1459.

Le jur ke seinte Osith alat, *Kant* li reys...l'enmenat 411—2.

*Meïsme l'houre k'*est venuz 1623.

E *gueres plus ne demora, K'*il autre feiz la resona 468.

Seinte Osith a *ceste houre* en pris *Ke* sur son chief...677.

L'*ure quant* sunt li chien passé 607.

ii. With compound conjunctions expressing:

(α) simultaneous action:

*Dementers k'*en ceste vie fu 195.

*A ceo k'*esteient haut chantant 1199 (cf. § 59).

(β) posterior action:

A ceo ke il ad parlé ci 1591 (cf. § 59).

A peine out Modwen sa voiz fini *Ke* de l'ewe Osith ne issi 351.

(For a discussion of this phrase, see § 59.)

Dekes a Deu s'est si rendue 709.

No *que*: *Hui est le quart jur* trespassant, Puis n'en oi mes...317.

(γ) anterior action:

De ci ke vint al vendredi 1540.

Si cum (= aussitôt) Edith *aveit veu* 309.

IX. *Que* comparative.

Bons fu ki...aime son creatur *Plus ke ne* fet autri 4.

Kant sa dolur a fet *assez Ke* tut put estre alessez 719—20.

Mes *plus* semblant *ne* fist la nef *Ke* maison fet le cuchetref 945[1].

Si l'aturne *a meuz ke* poeit 1099, also 1131.

Meux le vus voil dire...*K'*autre le vus die[2]...1365.

X. *Que* concessive.

As above with temporal clauses *quant* competes with *que*, so in causal, final and concessive clauses *cume* or *cum* is often found; this is the case in the only example in our text:

Ne sai cument...*Fors cum* Deu le vout...1049.

It would seem here, however, that *cum* or *que* should be omitted, cf. § 70.

[1] Cf. § 59.

[2] Note that this *que* stands for *que que*, English *than that*. This use was retained in Old French long after it had become impossible to omit *que*. Grammarians suggest that this should be avoided by using *que si* as: Il vaut mieux que l'innocent périsse que si toute la nation allait se révolter contre César (Massillon). What I believe to be the oldest instance of this is in the continental version of *Sainte Marie*: *Por ce est il plus avenant Que tu le doinses or a moi Que se je le donasse a toi*, cf. Ritchie *o.c.* p. 93.

§ 54. The conjunction, contd.

The value of the conjunction for determining the date of a literary work has been suitably foreshadowed by Mr Ritchie in the work mentioned in the foregoing section. The matter is bound to receive henceforth the closest attention of philologists. It is an additional test to be applied[1]. Unfortunately linguistic tests applied to French works produced in England are always somewhat unsatisfactory, since they may be at once more archaic and more modern than continental French works of like date. We remarked in § 17 that some knowledge of an author's upbringing is necessary and this often has to be arrived at by long and not always incontrovertible methods. Thus the *Vie de saint Gilles*, judged from the linguistic point of view, is perhaps as old as 1150 while certain matters of fact referred to in it place it certainly some quarter of a century later. Applying the test of the conjunction to our poem, we find that no violation of twelfth century syntax occurs in the main body of the work; it is only in (B) that we find *a peine... que* which, as is stated in § 59, I have not met with outside fourteenth century texts.

§ 55. Conjugation.

I. Persons:

The first person singular takes neither *e* nor *s* when these are not authorised by the etymology as is proved by the following rimes or scansion: *comant* (: *puissant*) 674; *cri* (: *ici*) 640, 1119; *jur* (: *seur*) 863, also *aim* 1287; *os* 20; *vei* (: *dei*, cf. § 31) 1602; *crei* (: *rei*) 253; *di* (: *oï*) 1657, (: *si*) 1636; *rent* (: *finablement*) 1292, also *promet* 527; *quer* 1122; *enquer* 994. The form *porte* 1220 is probably due to the scribe and the line should be emended as suggested in § 43; yet forms with *e* occur as early as *Brandan* (circ. 1120—5) while *doins* 737 is already in the *Roland* and the *Couronnement de Louis*.

The first plural ending is only once written *-ums* 961, otherwise it is *-um* but of course *sumes* 956; the ending *-um* is many times in the rime but always with itself, e.g. 1005, 1435 etc., 337 (B). The third plural has occasionally *-unt* (cf. § 5 iv), e.g. 28, 759 etc.

II. Infinitive:

The verbs of the first conjugation are never confused with those of the third as *saver* : *demorer* in *Beuve de Haumtone* 898 except *saver* : *targer* 304 in (B), cf. § 15. This phenomenon is common by the middle

[1] Thus Mr Ritchie applying this test to the *Pèlerinage*, considered by many to be an eleventh or very early twelfth century text, doubted that it should be ascribed to a date earlier than the end of the twelfth century, while M. Coulet (*Études sur le Voyage de Charlemagne*, Montpellier 1907) arrived at a like conclusion from other considerations.

of the thirteenth century and there are some cases in the rimed sermon *Deu le omnipotent*, e.g. *penser* : *aver* (altogether five cases in 122 sixains), but in certain texts as *St Richard* (circ. 1270) the confusion is limited to the commonest verbs as: *aver, saver, ver, poer, valer.* There are no instances of this in Gaimar, Adgar or *St Gilles.* The form *obli* (: *chai*) 283 suggests an infinitive *oblir*; such barbarisms are frequent in late thirteenth century Anglo-French.

III. Present:

The third person singular of *aler* is *vait* in rime with *trait* 669 and also *dreit* 899, cf. § 13; the third plural of *dire* is *dient* 927. In the subjunctive the verbs of the first conjugation have no *e* in the third person, e.g. *penst* 627; *purgart* (: *tart*) 407; *pardoint* 327 etc.; *aït* 1590. Other forms are *augent* 936; *donez* (i.e. *doniez*) : *targiez* 645. The third sing. of *saveir* is *sace* but not in rime. This is the normal form for Anglo-Norman; it is in rime with *grace* in the *Bestiaire*, in *St Laurent*, *Tristan* and Adgar and with *place* in *Ipomedon* 2297; from *prendre* we have *prenge* 1573, already in the *Bestiaire* 20 and *Donnei des Amanz* 74.

IV. Imperfect:

The imperfect ending *-out* of the first conjugation is only once *-finout*[1] (: *plout*) 212 found in rime contrary to the practice of most Agn. writers; the ending *-eit* which is often added to verbs of the first conjugation is here found only in three instances: two in (B) 201, 225 and one in (A) 1438. From *estre* we find *ert* 267 and *estoie* 987.

V. Preterite:

For *t* of the weak forms cf. § 31. The preterite of *chaïr* is *chaï* and of *remaindre remist*; this form is already in the *Bestiaire* but here only in (B); that of *voleir* is *vout* 453 and *vot* 237. The first sing. of *saveir* is *soi* 320. There are no 'dedi' perfects; thus the preterite of *tendre* is *tendi.* The form *fu* is alone used both before vowels and consonants.

VI. Future and conditional:

From *doner* we have *durra* 500 and *dureient* 1474; from *laissier* (*laier*) *larrum* 299; from *estre ert* 29; further *plereit* 242; *parra* 1574; the shortened forms of *faire*, e.g. *frai*, are common in Agn. since the *Bestiaire* and so too the trisyllabic forms *avera* etc.; these last are, however, always dissyllabic according to the scansion.

VII. Imperative:

The only form of interest is *diez* 328.

[1] This form even is not quite certain; the correct reading might be *fin out*; the tenses would then be in better agreement.

§ 56. The government of verbs.

Very little attention has been paid to the government of verbs in Old French in the standard grammars; I am therefore contenting myself with a simple constatation of facts as they are in this poem.

aidier vers 121, 126; here the prepositional complement seems rather to belong to *avancer* or *amendement.*

apendre de 754; usually with *a* or *envers,* e.g.

Deus ne fist terre qui envers *li n'apende*;

Il i (= *lui*) *apent Baviere et Alemaigne. Cour. de Louis* ll. 16—7.

comander (or *mander*, cf. § 59) followed by infinitive without preposition 577, 1244, 1451.

comencer without preposition 498, 275, 697, 777, 834. Cf. Burghardt, *Über den Einfluss des Englischen auf das Anglonormannische,* where many examples are quoted with *a, de* or no preposition; cf. too *St Richard* § 67.

donner vers 1693: no instance in Godefroy. Cf. *La Folie Tristan* (MS. Oxford) 323.

entendre vers 1556, generally with *a*, cf. l. 87; no instance in Godefroy.

mesfaire a 1572; the usual construction is with *vers*; Godefroy v 282.

mesprendre vers 1562; one instance in Godefroy viii 203 b; in the *Donnei des Amanz* 74 with *devers.*

oïr de with infinitive 429 and with *entour* 89; no instances in Godefroy.

se peiner de 429, 618; the examples in Godefroy are of much later date than our poem.

servir a 8, 759. This would appear to be a latinism, though classical Latin uses the dative or *apud*; I have only met this construction in religious and didactic work (cf. Koschwitz, *Commentar* p. 90, § 4). The same construction occurs in *Sainte Marie l'Égyptienne* l. 8[1]. Godefroy x 669 b quotes this use in a somewhat different sense.

tucher de 201, 1436. No examples in Godefroy of this use till modern times.

§ 57. Periphrastic constructions.

Our text contains many such constructions:

i. *aler* + present participle 1374, 1501, 1516, 1530, 1535, 1543.
ii. *estre* + „ „ 317, 474, 889, 1488, 1637, 1641, 1642.
iii. *venir* + „ „ 63—4, 1491.

[1] Further *Vie de saint André,* l. 397, *Et s'a mon Deu ne vus servir* in MSS. Paris, Arsenal 3516 and Oxford Canon. Misc. 74.

The reading *l'ad tut refusant* l. 62 should perhaps be *li va....* Instances of these constructions may be seen in plenty in mono-rimed tirades of *Renaut de Montauban.*

§ 58. *Voleir* with the infinitive.

This construction with a future sense has been called an anglicism by Burghardt, *l. c.* pp. 57—74. Without a fuller examination of continental didactic work I am not inclined to accept this view, but the frequency of the construction in Agn. is striking; since, however, the main output of Agn. literature is religious, the source should perhaps be looked for rather in late Latin didactic literature. Our text presents: *voil* + infinitive in ll. 65, 648, 742, 981, 982, 1364; *volum* + infinitive in line 1004; *voudrai* in line 642 and *voudrunt* line 1673.

§ 59. Words and phrases.

se aveir 1437. G. quotes this in the sense of 'se conduire'; its meaning here is rather the Latin one.

barun = husband 483, cf. *Panuce,* published by me in *Romania* XXXVIII p. 421.

brache = braquet 562. Godefroy only quotes *brachet,* cf. l. 565. Cf. *Bestiaire* of Guillaume le Clerc 224.

cheminal; see footnote to line 307.

chescum 190; Agn. scribes adhere carefully to the form *chescun* or *chascun* but in its adjectival use it is often found as e.g. *en chascun endreit*—a group of four syllables—where the scansion seems to demand *chaque,* a form of only rare occurrence in the thirteenth century (cf. Brunot, *Grammaire,* ii 320).

comander and *mander* 577, 1244, 1451; the confusion of these two verbs seems to be complete.

cuchetref 946. This word does not to my knowledge occur elsewhere; I believe it is the sail that was used as an awning and known in *St Gilles* as *tialz* (see below *teoldé*). Professor Brandin has kindly suggested to me that the line may perhaps have read *K'en maison fet le archetref*; I have not found *archetref* nor indeed *architrave* earlier than the sixteenth century. In favour of *cuchetref* may be cited several meanings of *couch* in the N.E.D. Professor Weekley suggests to read *Ke maison fet ne* (for *le*) *cuchetref.*

deit 934; see footnote to line, cf. § 53 iv A.

despire 166. This verb seems to be exclusively Norman and Agn.

empaourir 692. This would seem to be a variant of *espaourir,* cf.

Pèlerinage 709 where the MS. has *aspourie*: *espoörie* is also in *St Auban* l. 486 and *Vie de St Grégoire* by Angier, 1934.

enfundré 296. Godefroy quotes *enfonder* and variant *enfondrer*. The line should perhaps be corrected *enfondrés*; cf. § 65.

enteims 157, 939, 1479; according to G. Paris, Introduction to *St Gilles* p. xvii this word is not often found after the twelfth century. It occurs in the *Donnei* l. 375.

entrussément 499, *estrusser* 1111. The adverb and the phrase *a estros* are very common, but the verb does not appear in Godefroy in the sense it has here of 'to drive out.'

envilir 1517. Godefroy does not quote this form but only *aviler* and *enviler* in the meaning here implied. (For *en-* for *a-* see § 6.)

esquieler 1322 quoted by G. under *escueillier* = scutellarius, a scullery man. I am indebted to Professor Suchier for this hint.

esperital 308 = inspiration, only as an adjective in G.

frankeleins 490. G. does not quote this word; its meaning is evidently a small freeholder.

fanfelue 1318 = modern French *fanfreluche.*

gerrons 282 = the flaps of the cloak.

glu 1331, cf. Godefroy, Supplément.

gré = willingly 119. G. mentions this use but quotes no examples; I have met no other instance; the line should be emended as in § 53 I B.

krenke 290, apparently an English word such as Agn. writers often introduce into their works, e.g. *D'ales en engleis dist hom Ely*[1] (*Vie de Sainte Audrée*, folio 102 v° b).

menestraus 1444 = servants; in this sense its use seems to be confined to didactic literature, e.g. Alexis 65 d; Chardry, *Sept Dormanz* 766.

merir 1674 = reward; cf. G. v 259 a and the late Latin distinction between *mereo* and *mereor.*

ostez 574. Godefroy quotes *ostes* s.v.; 'exclamation employée pour repousser l'idée d'une chose'; it occurs very frequently according to him in the *Roman du saint Graal.* If this form is correct, it is interesting to consider it as an imperative forming an interjection and to compare it with the English *out!* which may possibly be formed on the same model.

overaine 1344 appears to be workwoman whereas *uveraine* 1298 seems to have the meaning of work to be done about a place.

oveskaus 1452, 1474 = ecclesiastics; G. only quotes as adjective.

[1] This is translated directly from Bede, cap. xvii (xix), ed. Plummer, p. 246 *Unde et a copia anguillarum...nomen accepit.*

seüz 562 = hunting dogs
suchier 339 < suspicari } . G. Paris, Introduction to *St Gilles* p. xviii, remarks that these two words seem not to be found after the twelfth century.

soil 1476. In the sense this word bears here, G. quotes no clear instances (cf. § 20). There is another instance in Sanson de Nantuil (apud Bartsch, *Lang. et Litt.* col. 152. 35).

taches 281 = the fastening of the cloak, i.e. *fibula*, as found in the glossary mentioned in *Documents manuscrits* (P. Meyer) p. 126 and published in the *Jahrbuch für rom. u. eng. Literatur* vii 37—8.

teoldé 874. The verb *teolder* is unknown elsewhere; as stated in the footnote, the word refers to the raising of the awning (*tialz*) over the waist of a ship when in port, its object was to increase the accommodation. Boats with tilts—tilt-boats—were in use on the Thames in the last century. In line 874 *bien* should be omitted.

veage 375 appears to have the meaning 'phase'; in this sense it is not quoted by Godefroy.

volage 239 = a frivolous person; not quoted by G. in this sense till 1386. Chardry has the word with the meaning frivolity: *Car jeo sai ke par volage, Estes entrez en tele rage. Sept Dormanz* 431—2.

a ceo que 1199, 1591. As will have been seen from § 53 viii, this conjunction is used to imply both simultaneous action with and posterior action to that of the principal verb. In the first sense its use is older than in the second and it should be noted that the first occurs in the older portion (O) and the second in (A). Mr Ritchie only found *en iceo que* in the twelfth century works he examined.

a merveille 215. This is an early use of the locution; generally one finds in Old French *merveilles* in this sense; this occurs in the same MS. in the life of St Audry, folio 117 v° a. Early instances of *a merveille* and *a merveilles* are to be found in *Roman de Troie* 1175, *Guillaume de Palerne* 36, and the *Lai de l'Ombre* 557, but *merveilles* is found as late as the Agn. life of Edward the Confessor (1256) l. 638.

a peine...que...ne 351. This seems to be the oldest case of this conjunction in the sense of scarcely...when... I have not found it before Froissart: *A paines estoient Flamenc cheü, quant pillart venoient...* and *Chevalier du papegai: il n'ot mie a peine finie sa parole, quant il vit venir ung chevalier* (quoted from Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, iv, p. 40). Notice that in each case *que* is replaced by *quant*. The cases of *a paine que* quoted by Mr Ritchie, p. 27, as e.g. *Cant je tres bien i pens, a paine ke n'en plor*; *Poème moral* 337 b, are not temporal conjunctions.

aveir cher 415 = *aimer.*

aveir en pris 677 = to delight in.

curant sur ventre 612, cf. *courir ventre à terre.*

n'i en ad 730, cf. modern *il n'en est rien.*

est a venir 261 = *devenir.* This is perhaps an anglicism, cf. *St Richard* § 71, e.g. *sui a venir* = *je dois venir.* Note this instance is in (B).

fere son bon 508, 513 = *faire son talent.*

fort serreit 851 (cf. § 44 A) = it would be difficult to... There are analogous cases in G., cf. *Forz serreit...*

quant est issi 665 = since it is so.

qui d'un qui d'el 1466 = what with one thing and another.

saver moun 554 = to learn the truth about; cf. *Romania* 1909, p. 420, l. 4.

semblant, voir semblant 1378 = they see no reason for asking; G. does not quote any example of this use.

souventefeiz 481, cf. *St Richard* § 57.

tantes feiz 523, cf. *St Richard* § 57; no example in Godefroy.

tel hore est = often, cf. G. under *eure*, iii 672.

tut dis 1415, 1653; this phrase is common in Agn. (less frequent elsewhere); cf. *Bestiaire* 2696; Marie de France, *Bisclavet* 318.

Versification.

§ 60. Divisions of the poem.

Certain reasons for stating that our poem as here published is the work of different periods have been set out in the Introduction; this diversity of authorship is rendered much more evident by an analysis of the versification. The oldest part may be designated as (O); the portion dealing with the punishment of Archbishop Richard as (A); and the Modwenna incident as (B).

The approximate division of the 1694 lines (three have been omitted by the scribe) is as follows:

(O) ll. 1—182, 387—1416 = 1212 (2 ll. omitted in this section),
(A) ll. 1417—1694 = 278 (1 line omitted),
(B) ll. 183—386 = 204.

The length of section (B) must necessarily be somewhat conjectural; ll. 182 and 382 seem by their similarity to suggest the limits of the interpolation, while a few lines before and after these would seem to

form the 'join.' Doubtless the matter of ll. 376—386 was in the original form of the poem as it is in both the Latin MSS. that are of importance—Bodley and Lansdown; the French lines are as close a translation as is generally the case in work of this kind. Another factor which weighed with me in thinking that section (B) should end with line 386 is that this line is very corrupt and contains ten syllables and although it is not more corrupt than many lines in Agn. poems, yet if we take out the word *home*[1] which seems to clash in sense with *rei* and re-write the line using good twelfth century forms, we get a perfectly correct line:

Al pöestëif rei Syer.

From this point onwards the lines are as regular as at any part of the poem.

§ 61. The couplet.

In his edition (*Romania*, XXV, pp. 497—541) of the interesting Agn. poem *Le Donnei des Amants*, G. Paris remarks: 'Notre poète est encore archaïque en ce qu'il est à peu près absolument fidèle à l'ancienne règle de versification exposée par P. Meyer, et d'après laquelle le sens est toujours arrêté au deuxième vers d'un "couplet" et ordinairement au deuxième vers de chaque couplet[2]. Il va même beaucoup plus loin et se rapproche, par la structure de son vers, des formes les plus anciennes du vers octosyllabique en français. Sur les 1242 vers de son poème qui nous ont été conservés, les huit dixièmes environ ont une quatrième syllabe qui porte l'accent tonique, et qui dans plus des deux tiers finit un mot (ou est pénultième avec élision de l'e final), tandisque dans l'autre tiers elle est pénultième sans élision. Des vers restants, la plupart ont une césure féminine avec accent à la quatrième syllabe (*Mires diënt que c'est santé*), et il n'y a guère qu'une vingtaine de vers en tout qui ne rentrent pas dans l'une ou l'autre de ces formules. Un pareil état de choses ne saurait être fortuit il suffit de mettre en regard

[1] In the life of St Audry in the same MS. the same scribe has made the same interpolation.

[2] In *Romania*, XXIII, pp. 1—35, M. Paul Meyer shows by very many examples that except perhaps for Adgar who is not careful of the couplet (it should be noted that, whereas English retains the etymological meaning of couplet, in modern French the word implies tirade or stanza) Agn. poets adhere to the rule of ending the sense with the couplet. He adds that for saints' lives this is generally the rule. The rule is observed too in those of the fourteenth century as e.g. Bozon, cf. *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, XXXIV, p. 295 and in those I have published, cf. footnote 4 of the introduction to St Osith. M. Meyer shows that the poet of importance who dared to break this rule is Chrétien de Troyes closely followed by Raoul de Houdenc. I am not aware that any Agn. writer has followed these innovations to any great extent.

de notre poème les 1200 premiers vers de *Perceval* ou de *Méraugis* pour voir que la proportion est tout autre....'

Considering our poem from the same points of view we find that the rule of the couplet may be said to have been observed almost without exception. Thus ll. 137—8 do not seem to be satisfactorily coupled and ll. 301—4 seem rather to be built up of three lines and one line, although the sense is complete with the fourth line, while ll. 329—331, 1471—3 and 1474—6 form what are probably the only real infractions; it should be noted, however, that these occur in (B) and in (A) only. Groups in which the sense is complete in two couplets are of course numerous, e.g. 1295—8, 1299—1302, etc. These infractions in (B) and in (A) are one of the many points for ascribing them to a later period than the main body of the poem.

§ 62. The line—syllabism.

An analysis of each separate line of the poem gives the following results:

A. Metrically correct octosyllabic lines:

		O		A		B	Total
		1210		277		204	1691
(1)	4+4, cesura after 4th syllable and ending a word	650		151		58	
	exs. ll. 13, 16, 38, etc.		1443		251		
(2)	Feminine cesura	107		23		17	
	exs. ll. 8, 20, 22, etc.		1491		218		
(3)	Césure enjambante	62		17		4	
	exs. ll. 7, 19		1516		192		
(4)	With feminine e after 4th syllable elided	49		12		4	
	exs. ll. 10, 30		1509		264		
(5)	Cesura after 5th syllable	69		11		10	
	exs. ll. 23, 78		1474		265		
(6)	Cesura after 3rd syllable	61		8		10	
	exs. ll. 80, 115		1503		259		
(7)	Cesura elsewhere	86		22		7	
	exs. ll. 45, 642		1598		280		
(8)	No cesura	24		4		13	
	exs. ll. 25, 50		1591		220		
(9)	Hiatus (cf. § 72)	30		7		3	
	exs. ll. 6, 14		1464		222		
	Total of octosyllabic lines	1138		255		125	
	Percentage of correct lines	94·05		91·6		61·25	

B. Metrically incorrect lines:

(*a*) Catalectic lines:

(1)	7 syllables (4+3)		7		—	6
	exs.	ll. 32			291	
(2)	7 (3+4)		2	2		1
	exs.	ll. 572		1576	256	
(3)	7—no cesura		2	—		5
	exs.	ll. 808			221	
(4)	7—cesura elsewhere		—	—		1
	ex.				270	
	Total of 7 syllable lines		11	2		13

(*b*) Hypercatalectic lines:

(5)	9=(4ɔ+4) epic cesura		7	5		18
	exs.	ll. 542		1580	249	
(6)	9=(5+4)		4	—		10
	exs.	ll. 898			232	
(7)	9=(4+5)		—	—		5
	ex.				273	
(8)	9—cesura elsewhere		4	3		13
	exs.	ll. 155		1449	215	
(9)	9—no cesura		1	—		2
	exs.	ll. 86			195	
(10)	Emendations made in footnotes or §§ 64–70		41	13		21
	Total of incorrect lines		64	22		82
	Percentage of incorrect lines		5·95	8·4		38·75

Comparing our results with those obtained for the *Donnei*, we find that they are almost precisely the same; in that poem two-thirds of eight-tenths (i.e. eight-fifteenths = 664 lines = 53·3 per cent.) are divided 4 + 4 or else have elided *e*, corresponding to our numbers (1) and (4); taking these for (O) we find our result is 57·8 per cent. and for (O) and (A) together 57·9 and for the whole poem 54·6 per cent. The remaining divisions do not exactly tally with our divisions; G. Paris does not state how he regards lines in his poem like:

(1) Tant poeit munter la parole 297,
(2) Esgardai les pomers floriz 13,
(3) Oï ses oiselès chanter 15,

which would have been classified in our tables under numbers (5), (6) and (7) respectively; but if we add the classes (3), (5), (6), (7) and (8) together we arrive at 24·9 per cent. which is practically the equivalent of

his four-fifteenth (or one third of eight-tenths as he says). That our poem should show an excess of regularity over the *Donnei* is quite in accord with the soberness of the subject.

§ 63. The line—position of the cesura.

The question whether the octosyllabic line has a cesura is much debated; the answer is certainly in the affirmative for a number of the oldest poems as the *Passion, vie de S. Léger, Gormunt et Isembart, Roman de S. Michel, Voyage de Brandan, Roman de Thèbes,* and the answer is possibly also the same for the *Roman d'Enéas, Roman de Troie* and the *Roman de Rou* and a great deal of the work of Marie de France. In a recent dissertation[1] the matter has been thoroughly gone into and a large number of texts carefully analysed. It is sometimes a little difficult to agree with the conclusions arrived at; thus e.g. the *lai Les dous Amanz* of Marie de France is stated to have 'einen Einschnitt in der Mitte' in 224 lines out of the 254, i.e. 88·2 per cent. I have examined this *lai* on the same plan as our poem (see preceding section) and should divide its lines in the following way: (1) 115, (2) 29, (3) 24, (4) 10, (5) 14, (6) 12, (7) 36, (8) 13. Therefore to arrive at the same results as the author of this dissertation we should need to agree that all lines except those under (5) and (6)—where the fifth and third syllable is tonic and ends the word—had an 'Einschnitt in der Mitte': but could the following lines be said to be so divided?

Exs. of (3), 24 in all:

(*a*) que mult est saive de mescines
tant cunuist herbes e racines 107—8.'

(*b*) tels letuaires vus durra 113.

(*c*) cungie demande a s'amie 130.

Exs. of (7), 36 in all:

(*a*) ne le refreschisse le cors 147.

(*b*) ne m'arestereie a nul fuer 200.

(*c*) unkes si dolente ne fu 232.

Exs. of (8), 13 in all:

(*a*) car ne s'en poeit consirer 28.

(*b*) e par druërie l'amast 66.

I point this out because the author indicates that a percentage of over 80 per cent. of lines with 'Einschnitt' in the middle is necessary

[1] Melchior, *Der Achtsilbler in der altfranzösischen Dichtung mit Ausschluss der Lyrik.* Leipzig, 1907.

before it can be stated that such system is intentional on the part of the poet. I would rather take the stricter view of the octosyllable with cesura and put the dividing line at about 60 per cent. I am inclined to believe that so far as Anglo-Norman saints' lives are concerned a pause is intentional and that it is due to the influence of music which continued to work when such poems were destined only for reading aloud. A lengthy examination I have in hand tends to show that saints' lives differ enormously in this particular, whereas the life of St Audry (end of XII century) has under Nos. 1, 2, 4 (cf. § 62 A) only 53 per cent., another life—that of St Andrew (written probably about the same time and by a Frenchman resident in England)—has fully 90 per cent. of these lines. It would seem probable that the skill in 'psalmody[1]' often attributed to pious people in Agn. saints' lives could extend to skill in reading—and a good deal of skill must have been necessary to make the ill-built lines run at all smoothly—the lives of saints.

An interesting side-light on the part to be left to the reader (or speaker) of Agn. lines is to be found in the Latin directions for the actors in the old drama of Adam[2]...*et, in rithmis, nec sillabam addant nec demant, sed omnes firmiter pronuncient et dicantur seriatim que dicenda sunt.*

§ 64. The irregularity of the line.

In the preceding section I stated my belief in the existence of the cesura in the Agn. octosyllable. The fact is of prime importance for the discussion of the irregularity of the line. I have stated before that the octosyllabic line is in a vast majority of cases built up of two groups; these groups may be of a varying number of syllables. Further, a feminine *e*, mute in a large number of cases as befits its unimportance in pronunciation, may become sonant when its presence is required to build a group. I will take examples of this phenomenon rather from a faulty thirteenth century text than from this life of St Osith which, so far as regards the main bulk of the poem, is fairly accurate. Thus in the life of *St Richard* by Peter of Peckham, written about 1270 we find:

(1) after a liquid, feminine *e* is generally silent:

Par la bele maisun seinte eglise[3] 1103;

[1] In the life of St Audry we find: *Adammis ont icil a non, Mult ert de grant religion; En vigile et en salmodie, Menoit iceo prudom sa vie*, folio 111, verso b. This life is written by a nun, named Marie.

[2] *Das Adamspiel*, hgg. Gross, Halle 1907², Romanische Bibliothek, No. 6.

[3] This line, torn from its context, might appear to be a line without cesura, but it is not so.

but when the tendency to group is evident we have:

De la cure k'avant aveit 788.

(2) after a dental, feminine *e* is frequently silent:

Que tut*e* la bible pres oït 796;

but when it is desired to form a grammatical unity or group:

Ot comencié de tute part 174.
Dunc fu preisé de tute gent 506.
Tute l'esglise enluminerent 720.

(3) after a nasal, feminine *e* is generally silent:

K'a pein*e* les piez moveir poeit 985;

but to form a group:

Est ceste eglise cum lune bele 1118.
Sachez le veir en bone fei 1337.

(4) the ending *-ent* (*-eient, -erent*) is also often silent:

D'ovre de martel fur*ent* forgez 688.
K'il avei*ent* tel tresor perdu 755.
Juger*ent* lequel le deust aver 605;

but to form a group:

Le loerent ke il amast 267.

(5) between consonants (especially *muta cum liquida*) feminine *e* is often silent:

Priveement a sei appella 1331.
Son chapelein k'especial aveit 1321;

but to form a group:

Sire Williame sun chapelein 1373.

There is another phenomenon that strengthens my view, viz. that the line that has no cesura is not only rare but comparatively regular in scansion (cf. the tables, § 62). Again in cases where the line without cesura is too long or too short it is susceptible to very simple and evident emendation. Taking examples again from *St Richard* we find:

(6) after a vowel, feminine *e* is generally mute:

E jeo par l'aïe seint Richard 59;

but when the line has no pause:

Dunt joie de quer de li out 609.
Dunt jeo esteie tant grevez[1] 548;

(7) after a liquid, feminine *e* is silent:

De fere dreiture ne se feint mie 636;

but when the line has no cesura:

E issi fere le soleit 781.

[1] This line could be emended to *...itant*, but the form only occurs once in the poem.

A sonant feminine *e* after a de tal, a nasal, in the ending *-ent* and between consonants (for mute *e* see Nos. (2), (3), (4), (5) above) is found in the following lines:

(8) E grant multitude de gent 1531.

(9) Veeir coment l'alme passa 1516.

(10) (*a*) Ke mal me furent par itant 549,

(*b*) Pur ceo chanterent sanglutant 1684.

(11) L'ercevesque e sun chancelier 714.

When then Professor Suchier says in his memorable review of Atkinson's edition of the *Vie de seint Auban* (p. 26): 'Sobald der Achtsilbler sechs oder neun Silben hat, ist die Cäsur obligatorisch,' I should agree with him, only I should add that *because of the cesura* such irregularity becomes possible. I should not like to suggest that the ear of the Agn. writer was absolutely at fault but the words of the defective hemistich must have been so pronounced as to produce an approximation to the necessary four syllables or at least have produced a similar effect. It would be hazardous to attempt to say how nearly or in what way a line containing one or two defective hemistiches was extended in pronunciation so as to approximate to the octosyllable but one or two remarks may not seem beside the point. It will be noticed in the following paragraphs and in the examples quoted by Suchier in the above-mentioned review that most of the defective hemistiches contain a diphthong and that when this diphthong had *i* as its second component that letter is represented by *y*[1]. This would certainly seem to be an indication as to the pronunciation to be adopted by the reader. Again that *é* could be diphthongal is proved by § 15, while the practice of inserting *y* or *i* before the tonic when a vowel follows (cf. § 15) and the frequent spelling of an accented vowel by double letters must surely point to change in pronunciation.

It seems to me that in this grouping or non-grouping must lie the explanation of the irregularity of the Anglo-Norman line.

§ 65. The line with 7 syllables.

A great many of the inaccuracies of an Anglo-French work in a MS. written in England must doubtless be attributed to the scribe, but one and the same scribe cannot be blamed for the difference in inaccuracy such as is found in our poem—7·2 per cent. for (O) and (A) combined and 38 per cent. for (B): this must be attributed to the authors.

[1] I am, of course, aware of the various criticisms of Suchier's theories, but they amount generally only to emending the exs. used, yet it is admitted by all that this may be carried too far; there is in every text a residue of defective lines not susceptible to emendation.

I have stated in the foregoing paragraph that I ascribe this inaccuracy mainly to the grouping or non-grouping, but firstly all reasonable efforts should be made to secure as accurate a text as possible. First I will consider the short lines in (O) and in (A).

32 This line consists of one correct group and another that has three syllables. I suggest that the second group was originally bor fu *cil* nez, but here also the word bour with diphthong suggests another explanation.

92 This line is emended in a footnote.

572 This line is defective in its first hemistich; this half line would possibly be read *tut a pi-yé*, the diphthongisation being rendered possible by the following vowel of *alé*; the emendation *trestot a* (or *de*) *pié* is also possible.

808 This line having no cesura should be emended; the emendation is obvious, the Latin text has *caput...ambabus manibus*; our text should therefore have *dous mains*.

844 Defective in the second hemistich; the future *ert* may be read *iert* diphthongally; it would be possible to emend to *sera*.

958 Defective in the second hemistich; here the diphthong of *vient* seems to explain the deficiency. I have noticed a short line again and again in Agn. with this word.

968 As there is no cesura emendation is necessary; I propose to insert *tut: De tut ceo....*

1034 After the impersonal verb *avint* a relative *ceo* should be inserted, cf. l. 322.

1186, 1254, 1336, 1385, 1405 are emended in the footnotes.

1576 In the text I have corrected on the grounds that the longer form appears in l. 1623, it would perhaps be better to allow the form of the MS. to stand and to insert a necessary co-relative *ceo* before *esprover*, the line would then fall into the two group system.

In (B) the faulty lines are much more numerous; in cases where the cesural pause is not strongly marked or where there is no cesura I propose to emend as follows:

190 Corr. *en* fere cert; the phrase requires a complement.

221 Use the form *Modwenne* as in line 217 and explain hiatus as in § 72.

225 Corr. *ceo* aveneit, a co-relative is lacking, cf. *Erec* 5809, *Cligès* 4440 and line 322.

256 Corr. *trestut* l'or.

291 Corrected in the text.

293 Read *amedeuz* as in line 341 which should become *amdeuz*.

296 It would seem simple to emend *come* en un puiz but the meaning is obscure since it is not clear whether the author means to say that Osith and her book were actually sunk in a hole in the river bed or whether the *krenke* is a *puiz*.

298 Corr. en *icel* duit.

323 Except for the instances in G. I have met the form *leus* only in the Agn. MS. of St Marie l'Égyptienne; *lues* means in Old French 'immediately,' but neither in that text nor here does this meaning seem to come out of the context. In *St Marie* it is emended in various ways by the other MSS.; it seems to me that here the text should read *iluec*, and this would then give the required eight syllables.

363 Use the form *Modwenne* as in line 217.

367 The line may be read with pause after *ewe*; cf. § 72.

373 Read *adonc*.

In making so many emendations in (B) I might seem to be abandoning the principles laid down in § 63, but this is only apparently the case; (B) is a thirteenth century episode and the faulty lines in poems of that century are so by reason of their hypermetric lines rather than by those that are too short; a glance at the tables in § 62 will show this; there the hypermetric lines for (O) are no more than 53 out of 1210 lines while (B) has 69 out of 204; therefore the short line in a thirteenth century poem is much more likely to be due to the scribe than is the hypermetric line[1]. In *St Richard* the lines with seven syllables did not amount to five per cent. of the incorrect lines and were readily emendable.

§ 66. The lines of 9 syllables with epic cesura.

The existence of this cesura is generally denied for all except a few of the oldest poems, e.g. the *Passion*:

> Jesus reis magnes est sus montez 26.
> Chantet aveient de Jesus Crist 28.
> Sus en la piedre li angles sist 401.

In other poems it is generally taken as a negligence. In certain Agn. poems however it occurs so frequently that I am inclined to see in it a recognised practice, a natural outcome of the division of the line

[1] This phenomenon is not without exceptions, e.g. in the life of St Thomas (cf. § 66) out of 432 lines 163 are short and 21 only too long according to the editor, while in the life of Edward the Confessor (1265) the first 700 lines contain 135 short lines and about 30 of 9 syllables.

into groups; it seems logical to assume that if the line may have an uncounted syllable at the end it may also have one at the pause in the middle. I have made a few statistics of the frequency of this line in Agn. octosyllabic poems:

Gaimar: *Estorie*, ll. 1000—2000	3 cases (ll. 1058, 1590, 1887).
Adgar: Theophilus legend (No. 17)	2 cases (ll. 62, 1005).
Vie de S. Gilles	no cases.
Adamspiel	6 cases.
Haveloc (ll. 1195)	4 cases (ll. 78, 294, 388, 788).

In these poems then it would be impossible to consider this as more than negligences on the part of author or scribe, but when we come to poems of the thirteenth century the number of such lines increases greatly; and we find:

Fragments d'une Vie de S. Thomas (circa 1220)	6	cases in	432	lines.
Vie de sainte Modwenne (first 100 quatrains)	15	„	400	„
Chardry: *Petit Plet* (circa 1230) ll. 1—400	28	„	400	„
St Richard (circa 1270) ll. 1—400	43	„	400	„

The cases of this kind of error in (O) seem to be like those of the first group of poems mentioned above; that is, negligences of scribe or poet and susceptible to emendation; thus:

176 The poem seems to me old enough to suggest that *ke* be omitted (cf. § 53, iii).

542 *ariere*: for this form read *arier*.

623 *esteient*: verbal endings were the first to be disregarded in scansion, especially where the cesural pause was at all marked. This I prefer to regard as a poet's negligence rather than to suggest the omission of *tut*.

695 This appears to be a faulty line, though *tant* may be due to the scribe.

696 Here *ke* may be omitted; *deable* as a dissyllable is well known and not merely in Agn.

793 *saillirent*: This might appear to be a case of omission of word ending as in line 623 above, but the line can be emended in two ways; by omission of initial *E* or by changing the tense to *saillent* in accordance with the tense of the second line of the couplet; this last commends itself best to me since the line has no cesural pause and according to § 64 the feminine *e* should be sonant.

1184 The initial *si* is not required; additions at the beginning of a line are among the usual contributions of scribes.

The cases in (A) can all be arranged in the one class; they consist in the uncounted *-e* or *-es* after the fourth syllable; such lines are 1473, 1475, 1486, 1580, 1616.

The cases in (B) are like those in (A) and prove that for the author the feminine *e* after the tonic accent may be mute, especially at the middle of the line: cf. ll. 213, 217, 242, 243, 244, 247, 249, 258, 268, 281, 285, 300, 308, 321, 333, 341, 345, 358.

§ 67. The line with tonic accent on the fifth syllable.

The four cases in (O)—there are none in (A)—are doubtless all due to the scribe; the following emendations are offered:

898 *avera*: the tense seems incorrect, read *a*.

1033 The pronoun *il* may be omitted; cf. § 48.

1099, 1244 These lines have been corrected in the footnotes.

The instances in (B) are more difficult of treatment; we must assume that the first hemistich containing five syllables must have been so pronounced as to be brought within the group. It is hazardous to do more than suggest how this was done.

215 The locution *a merveille* is probably due to the scribe, the usual Old French *merveilles* (cf. § 59) read with mute *e* would reduce the line.

232 Perhaps a shortened form of the name was used.

241 We may assume the pronunciation *ap'la*; cf. § 64 (5).

274 The pronunciation of *damisele* seems to have been whittled down to damzel (cf. English damsel) and the same form must be assumed for lines 315, 329, while in line 347 where the expression is more formal and the line without pause, we have the normal number of syllables.

287 Corrected in text.

313 The feminine *e* of *bele* must be mute (cf. § 64 (1)); this seems natural in a stock phrase like *bele suer*.

316 It seems difficult to assume the pronunciation *livr'* but instances are plentiful in Agn.

343—4 It is suggested in footnote to omit *ke*; cf. § 53 (iii).

350 This line has probably been altered by the scribe; though the raising of Lazarus is often referred to in Old French literature, e.g. *Jhesus lo Lazer suscitet* (*Passion*, l. 30), the phrase *al tierz jur* seems rather to refer to Christ's own resurrection; of Lazarus we read: *Venit itaque Jesus et invenit eum quattuor dies jam in monumento habentem* (Joannis xi, 17). I would propose to read: *Ki fu suscitez al tierz jur* (For the

tense in use in Agn. cf. *E cum il fu resuscité* in the Agn. anonymous translation of the *Evangile de Nicodème*, line 11, S. A. T.). I would further support this emendation by remarking that in none of the Latin texts of the Life of Modwenna which the author may have used as sources for the account of Osith's immersion is there any reference to Lazarus.

351 This should perhaps be explained as in l. 232; for *a peine* cf. § 59.

§ 68. The line of 9 syllables with accent on the fourth, i.e. with hypermetrical second hemistich.

212 In thirteenth Agn. the definite article is apt to lose its syllabic value, thus the second hemistich will form a group of four.

273, 284 Read *ew'*.

374 Old French reïne has been influenced in its development by *rei*, it is best to take this as an instance of its modern form *reine* with diphthongal *ei*.

380 *enseinement*: the feminine *e* is mute as in *St Richard* 3, § 64.

§ 69. The line of 9 syllables without cesura.

According to my remarks in § 64 these lines should all admit readily of emendation. Note there is only one in (O) and two in (B).

88 The initial *Kar* is to be omitted as an addition of the scribe.

195 Two solutions are possible (i) that the initial syllable of *dementers* is slurred—a frequent occurrence in Agn., cf. Suchier, *Seint Auban*, p. 34; Simund de Freine, p. liv and *St Richard*, § 72. (ii) that the *e* of *vie* is silent. Such lines are not uncommon in Agn., cf. *St Richard*, § 100. It must have been left to the choice of the reader to decide on the proper pronunciation.

226 The word *loinz* may be an insertion due to the scribe; in the life of Modwenna written by Geoffrey of Burton we find: *Modvenna fecit manere Atheam cum sorore regis* (*sc.* Editha) *in uno* [sc. *monasterio*, cf. ll. 218—9], *ipsa vero vacans orationibus aliquantis diebus solitaria mansit in altero...Editha...desideravit mittere aliquid ad magistram suam venerabilem Modvennam. Vocavit itaque puellam Osid et dicit ei: vade, inquit, ad dominam...et defer ei ex parte mea volumen istud.* The narrative gives us to understand further that the place of Modwenna's retreat was close by.

§ 70. The line of 9 syllables with cesura elsewhere.

Like the lines of the preceding paragraph, these should mostly be subject to emendation. We will first consider these in (O) and (A).

155 Read *example en prist de chasteté.*

528 Read *v'ray* and cf. § 5.

1049 Omit *cum* and cf. § 53 x.

1449 Omit *E.*

1451 Correct *manda*; cf. § 59.

1496 Omit *ke*; cf. § 53 i, iii, A.

The following in (B):

262 The feminine *e* of *message* is mute.

266 This is a case of doubtful scansion like line 195 in the preceding paragraph; either omit *kar* or consider the final *e* of *fere* as mute.

268 Read *pucel'.*

272 Read *Modwen* as suggested in § 67.

290, 344 Corrected in text.

327 Omit *ke*; cf. § 53 iii.

365—6 Omit *ja* and for *Osith* read *ele,* the name is rendered unnecessary by its appearance in the following line.

384 The enjambement entails a pause and brings about the mutation of the final *e* of *pere.*

§ 71. Other irregular lines.

These occur only in (B) and to a much less degree in (A).

205—6 The great irregularity of these lines is probably due to the scribe; in the list of Penda's pious descendants we only read of daughters (ll. 151—2) so that possibly the author only wrote:

E uncles de grant poësté
E auntes de grant chasteté.

210 Read *nul' maner'.*

214 Read *Modwen'* as suggested in § 70 and *abess'.*

235 The first hemistich must be read *exampl' trova.*

247 Read *doctrin'* and *el'.*

255 Corrected in text.

261 Read *v'nir*; for other instances cf., authors quoted, § 69, l. 195.

276 For *comensa* read the equivalent *se prist*; *se prendre* like *comencier* may be used without prepositional complement in Agn.

277 Read *river'*; the line is otherwise faulty.

286 The first hemistich consists of six syllables; it may have been read as *al prendr' s'abaiss'*.

301 This line has no cesura and so should be easily emendable: the sense seems to require 'when the dawn of the fourth day came.' I propose to adopt the reading of the MS. for line 269, *en la matinée*, and read *Del quart jur en la matinée*.

304 The original may have read *achoise* or *ochoise* and the group have been intended to be read *achois' saveir*: for initial *en* cf. § 6.

305 Read *El quer*....

308 The second group would be read *par sperital*; the word *espirit* and its compounds are of varying syllabic values in Agn.; cf. *Simund de Freine*, p. xlix.

328 Omit *vus* and read *verté*, a well-known form collateral with *verité*.

329 The first hemistich must be read *V'istes un' damsel'*...; cf. § 65.

330 Read *La matinée tierz jur fu hier*; the article may be readily omitted with expressions of time; cf. l. 334 and *Se vus y demoures tier jur li empereres et si traiteur ont pourparlé une grande traison*: Robert de Clari, *La Prise de Constantinople*, xxiii, 16; cf. Fredenhagen, *Über den Gebrauch des Artikels*, p. 17.

333 Read *Un' tel pucel'*.

372 Since there is no cesura, this line should be emended; it should probably read *Kar l'en le tendreit a fols gas*.

386 Cf. § 60.

The following two lines are in (A):

1438 The phrase *de Chich* is probably a gloss inserted into the text by the scribe.

1440 The *aset* seems to be spurious and may be deleted, it looks like the mental reservation of an interested scribe.

§ 72. Hiatus.

The question of hiatus in Old French poetry has received full and careful attention in the vast work of Rydberg on the history of feminine *e* in French[1]. It is extremely difficult to classify this phenomenon and examples appearing in one class may well find a place in another. The most salient divisions seem to be: A. Logical hiatus, where a final feminine *e* counts so as to allow the word its full syllabic value and to give it special prominence in the line. B. Metrical; in which the final feminine *e* must be counted to preserve the measure and the acceptance

[1] Gustaf Rydberg, *Zur Geschichte des französischen e*. Upsala, 1896—1907, p. 1099.

of which division entails the acceptance of the theory of a cesura. C. Grammatical; in which a feminine *e*, becoming final by the decay of the dental ending yet remains unelided before a following vowel. D. Analogical; in which an *e* after a heavy consonant group retains its syllabic value even before a vowel.

As instances of these we will quote from Rydberg, taking Agn. exs.:

A. Out Rome / en baillie (6 sylls.), *Comput*, 1923.
Ki d'Africke / ala requerre (8 sylls.), *Tristan* (de Thomas), 665.

B. De la nue / eisut s'en sunt (8 sylls.), *Brandan*, 1667.

C. Ainz que pusse(t) / entrer païs (8 sylls.), *Brandan*, 616.

D. Pur espuser l'altre / Ysolt, *Tristan* (de Thomas), 307.

Our poem contains examples of all these kinds; the first group may be subdivided as follows:

A. Logical:
(*a*) Proper names—these may need special prominence;
1. Querondone / est apellée 184.
2. Modwene / en l'un sujurna 221.

(*b*) A pause in the sense;
1. Et martyre / a chef de tur 64.

This may be a case for emendation to the form *martirie* which may occasionally be found in rime with words in *-ie*.

2. E cele / en fait doil mut grant 1116.
3. Ceste overaine / endormir 1344.

(*c*) With *ne, ou, ke, le*;
(*α*) *ne*: Ne ci ne / ailleurs ja ne pert 6.
Ne / en pernent autre rançun 773.

It would perhaps be better to adopt the Agn. form *raansun* (cf. *St Gilles*, 2986). For other instances, cf. ll. 676, 1072, 1087, 1163, 1390, 1528, 1681.

(*β*) *ou*: Et meindre / ou ses chers amys 1691 (cf. below D).

(*γ*) *ke*: Ke / en puissez aveir aïe 124.
Also the lines 469, 805, 1146, 1327, 1403, 1487.

(*δ*) *le*: K'apertement le / unt vëu 1064.

(*d*) Vowel followed by *e* (*et*);
Ly reis escute / e entent 549 (cf. below C).

B. Metrical:
1. Ke de l'ewe / Osith n'issi 352.
2. L'ewe / ou Osith fu neée 367.
Also lines 1201, 1215, 1649.

C. Grammatical:

Bien li puisse / estre gradée 410.

D. Analogical: after a heavy consonant group;

1. Seinte / e dure e preciuse 74.
2. Et a creindre / e a doter 106.

Also lines 152, 159, 222, 233, 488, 687, 720, 1079, 1464, 1569.

Modern editors are admitting a greater use of hiatus than formerly. It is certain that it plays a great part in Agn. I have on hand a very lengthy inquiry into the octosyllabic line and its development, and in the 20000 lines I have already examined its use is evidently very extensive. It would be, however, premature to communicate any of the results here.

§ 73. Enjambement.

The feeling that secures careful observation of the rule of the couplet will make for regularity in the line itself and enjambement will be rare. The shortness of the octosyllabic line renders an overflowing into a successive line necessary occasionally. Thus Chrétien de Troyes and Raoul de Houdenc do not shrink from this licence. An enjambement such as the following[1] savours of flippancy:

Et n'an i a nul, qui n'et *un*
Baston cornu de corneillier (*Yvain*, 5514—5);

but others such as

1. Quant dui chevalier sont ansanble
   Venu as armes an bataille (*Yvain*, 1694—5).
2. Chascuns grant piece mal tailliée
   En ot; bien en furent peu (*Songe d'Enfer*[2]),

are very common.

Our poem contains the following cases:

In (B), 5 cases:

Et par les gerrons a sei (le) prist
Son mantel ke le livre obli 282—3.

Also lines 385—6, 399—400.

The enjambement that takes up the whole of the following line is very common in the octosyllable.

[1] Quoted by Tobler, *Versbau*, and Kastner, *Versification*; I quote it according to the last edition of *Yvain*.

[2] Quoted from Bartsch, *Langue et Littérature*, col. 244, ll. 19—20.

In (A) there are the following 4 cases:

D'iluec purveit queus enverreit
A Chich, kar ces fors mettreit 1471—2.

Also lines 1474—6 (2 cases), 1499—1500.

In the remainder of the poem we have only two cases:

E pense bien k'en son muster
Als païs doner a(vera) mester 897—8.
Ele est a seinte Osith par non
Venue par avision 1211—2.

Both of these are of the kind that is normal. In this particular again we see that the deviations from early continental usages occur most frequently in (B), less frequently in (A), and that they are not prominent in (O).

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

HÖLDERLIN AND 'DIOTIMA.'

FRIEDRICH HÖLDERLIN'S poetry is, in the words of Wilhelm Dilthey[1], 'in ihrer Weise ein Höchstes nach Goethe'; his life story is one of the most pathetic in the annals of literary history: yet neither his poetry nor his life has ever been adequately treated in English. The best account of the poet in our language, that of W. A. Braun[2], comes to us from America and is written from a point of view which necessarily spoils the perspective of the picture. Apart from this we have only a page or two in the histories of German literature and a column in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which is marred by more than one serious error. In the following article no attempt is made to give a complete account of the poet's life or work, since to do this on an adequate scale would be out of the question in the space available. My chief aim at present is to place before the English reader the letters which passed, or were intended to pass, between Hölderlin and Frau Gontard after they were separated and before the poet's mind became clouded. These letters, or drafts of letters, as they may more properly be called, have been recently rescued from neglect by Dr W. Böhm, who was the first editor to print the fragments written in 1799 by Hölderlin to Diotima and to appreciate the importance of the fragment from Diotima to Hölderlin, part of which was given by Hölderlin's biographer and editor, Chr. Th. Schwab, in 1846. The original German text of these letters will be found in Böhm's selection of Hölderlin's letters[3]. For the sake of clearness and to remove some misconceptions, I preface the correspondence with a few notes on events in the poet's life before the Homburg period (1798—1800), during which these letters were written. The evidence adduced will, I hope, make it tolerably clear that Hölderlin's love for Diotima, though it put him temporarily in a difficult and painful position, was on the whole more beneficial than harmful to him.

[1] *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung*, 3rd ed., Leipzig 1910, p. 380.
[2] *Types of Weltschmerz in German Poetry*, New York, 1905. (Cp. *Modern Language Review*, vol. II, pp. 186—8.)
[3] W. Böhm, *Hölderlins Briefe* (*Auswahl*), Jena, 1910.

I.

On leaving Tübingen Hölderlin became tutor to the son of Major and Frau von Kalb. He left this post not merely, as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* states, 'to attend Fichte's lectures and to be near Schiller in Jena,' or, as Wilbrandt[1] put it, out of 'Unmut..., als Erzieher wenig zu leisten und in seiner Selbstbildung sich gehemmt zu sehen.' These were at most secondary motives; the primary was the instinct of self-preservation. It is plain from his letters and from that of Frau von Kalb to his mother that his health was being undermined by his duties. His pupil was not only mentally feeble, but had contracted vicious habits, rendering it necessary for him to be watched day and night. Hölderlin clung to the task much longer than, for his own sake, he ought to have done, and gave it up only when he realised that it was hopeless.

The same elementary instinct of self-preservation drove him out of Jena, where he felt himself overpowered by the presence of such 'grosse Geister' as Fichte and in particular Schiller, before whom, he wrote later, he was 'like a plant that has just been set in the soil. At midday it must be covered up.' He retreated to Nürtingen where he soon became very unhappy, a victim to the 'Höllengeister' of remorse at the folly of running away. Yet at the time the step had been inevitable. Schiller's influence was dangerous, 'vernichtend,' as the wise Diotima saw and wrote later.

Then came, in Dec. 1795, the tutorship in the house of 'Banquier Gontard,' at first a period of almost unmixed joy, as we learn from the poet's letter of June 10, 1796 to his old college friend Neuffer, which tells how he has come into 'a new world.'...'There is a being in the world with whom my spirit can and will busy itself thousands of years, and even then still see how schoolboy-like all our thinking and understanding appears in the presence of Nature...' The summer and autumn of 1796 brought still more happiness. Gontard remained in Frankfort while the tutor accompanied his wife and children to Cassel and Driburg. On February 16, 1797 Hölderlin writes again to Neuffer from Frankfort, 'I have sailed round a world of joy since last we wrote to one another... And it is still so! I am still just as happy as in the first moment. 'Tis a continuous, joyful, holy friendship with a being

[1] *Hölderlin. Reuter* (*Geisteshelden*, ed. A. Bettelheim), 2nd ed., Berlin, 1896, p. 17.

that has simply lost its way into this poor, spiritless, disordered century of ours!...'[1]

But the horizon was growing dark. 'Whom the gods love, to him is apportioned great joy and great sorrow,'—such is the pathetic quotation with which this letter ends. Already in Oct. 1796 Hölderlin had written to Hegel words of bitter scorn about the 'society men and women of Frankfort.' In the house of 'Banquier Gontard,' a 'Frankfurter Geldmensch' of the most pronounced type, the tutor was treated by host and guests alike as a menial. He felt himself always 'the fifth wheel on the coach,' though obliged for form's sake to be present. How far his attachment to his employer's wife was remarked and scoffed at we do not know. At least it kept him bound in an otherwise hateful house for some two years after their return from Driburg (Sept. 1796), though already in July 1797 he wrote to Neuffer that he was 'torn in two by love and hate.' Then began the still more gruesome sensation of being haunted 'by the nothingness that yawns round about us like a precipice...' No doubt hateful things were being said: Diotima's reputation was perhaps itself at stake. Still Hölderlin delayed, culpably perhaps but very humanly, the inevitable parting. Not till the autumn of 1798 did the unhappy lover tear himself away from the house of torment,—'after holding out a great while with much patience.' The dramatic story of the jealous housekeeper poisoning the mind of the careless husband and by persistent insinuations goading him to a stormy scene with the lovers rests upon doubtful evidence and does not tally with Hölderlin's own account, which, however, scarcely reveals the whole truth[2]. To his mother he wrote on October 10, 1798 to explain his sudden flight to Homburg vor der Höhe, where he had joined the sympathetic Sinclair. 'The rude pride, the purposeful, daily contemptuousness of all knowledge and culture, the direct expressions of the opinion that tutors too were mere servants, that they could not expect any special

[1] Somewhat perversely C. C. T. Litzmann maintained that Hölderlin never conceived the passion of love for Diotima: 'Diotima blieb ihm eine schwesterliche Freundin, sie war sein "Schutzgeist,"' he writes in his *Friedrich Hölderlins Leben. In Briefen von und an Hölderlin*, Berlin 1890, pp. 309 f. On the element of 'Übersinnlichkeit' in Hölderlin's love, cp. W. A. Braun, *op. cit.*

[2] W. Dilthey (*op. cit.* p. 387) says Hölderlin's departure 'geschah zweifellos aus eigenem Entschlusz.' Dilthey relied on the evidence of the poem *Der Abschied* and of the letter to his mother. But Hölderlin always spared his mother unpleasant details. If he was driven out of Gontard's house by some special insult, as is not unlikely, he would most probably not have told her more than he hints at in the letter. But the details of the scene were probably richly embroidered by gossip. K. Müller-Rastatt (*Friedrich Hölderlin, sein Leben und sein Dichten*, Bremen, 1894) accepts the whole story as given by C. Jügel in *Das Puppenhaus* (Frankfort, 1857). C. Litzmann thinks it a 'myth'; B. Litzmann that it was 'not altogether off the right track,' and that Hölderlin was probably subjected to some insult.

treatment, since they were paid for what they did and so forth, and many other insults hurled at me, just because it is good form to treat tutors thus in Frankfort,—all this sickened me—for all that I tried hard to disregard it—more and more all the time, and wrought in me oftentimes a silent wrath which is never good for body or soul. Believe me! I was patient! If you have ever believed one word I told you, then believe this! You will think that I exaggerate when I tell you that it is at the present day simply impossible to hold out long in such circumstances; but if you could see how much the rich merchants, particularly in Frankfort, are embittered by the present times, and how they vent this bitterness of spirit on everyone dependent on them, you would find what I say easy to understand.'

He refuses to say more, since he does not care to speak evil of these people, but proceeds: 'In the end I was forced to determine on the hard parting from the dear children... I explained to Herr Gontard that my plans for the future required that I should place myself for a time in a position of independence. I avoided all further explanations, and we parted politely from one another.'

The letter ends with some warm regrets for the loss of his pupil, Henri Gontard. 'He will never forget me nor I him.' There is not one word of Henri's mother, of whom his heart was too full to speak.

II.

The treatment meted out to Hölderlin by Gontard and his friends had cut him to the quick. 'Hatred of the common and unclean gnawed at his soul,' says Dilthey. The normally gentle spirit was goaded into a cry for vengeance, none the less anguished that it was only a cry and not an act:

> Wenn ich sterbe mit Schmach, wenn an den Frechen nicht
> Meine Seele sich rächt, wenn ich hinunter bin,
> Von des Genius Feinden
> Überwunden, ins feige Grab.....

Only his undiminished love for Diotima and his passionate desire to fulfil his poetic mission made life any longer desirable. In these first months at Homburg, in the end of 1798, his fears and sufferings wrung from him those two utterly pathetic cries, 'Nur einen Sommer gönnt, ihr Gewaltigen!' and 'Doch uns ist gegeben, Auf keiner Stätte zu ruhn...' 'I need peace,' he had cried at Frankfort: in the same spirit he had fled to Homburg, where his unfailing friend Isaac Eduard von Sinclair had found him a quiet lodging. This man's devotion to the

friend whose genius he realised and whose personality he loved, proved from this time forth so splendid in its quiet strength and self-sacrifice, that it shines out in the darkening gloom of the poet's life like some kindly star of hope. 'The last scion of an ancient Scottish family settled in Homburg,' Isaac von Sinclair was no unworthy member of his race.

In Homburg and in Rastatt, whither Sinclair carried him off to attend the political Congress, Hölderlin once more fell in with interesting intellectual society. In Sinclair's own family and in the court of the Landgrave of Hesse he was made a welcome guest. He was delighted with both families; Sinclair's he found 'vortreffliche,' the Landgrave's 'ächtedele Menschen.' 'At the court my book has given some pleasure and they have wished to make my acquaintance,' he wrote home with pardonable pride. But for the most part he lived alone or in the company of Sinclair. 'Every hour spent with such a man means spiritual gain and added joy for his companion.' 'Truly there can be but few friends who are so much each other's master and servant in one,' he adds, explaining to his mother how each of them was expected by the other's mother to play Mentor to her son. For the sake of greater independence Hölderlin had refused to live in Sinclair's house, and 'having once again turned hermit' in obedience, as he puts it, 'to my nature and my Fate,' he saw scarcely anyone save his friend Sinclair, and a Professor Muhrbeck of Greifswald whose philosophic but 'restless spirit' Hölderlin highly esteemed. Outwardly he wanted for nothing essential, for he was able to rent 'a pair of pretty little rooms'—the living room he adorned with the maps of the four quarters of the earth—and such furniture as satisfied his simple wants. Sinclair and Muhrbeck provided him with almost too rich 'a flow of soul' for one who needed to remain 'undistracted and far from the spell of other men's ideas and interests.' 'This apart, the peculiar beauties of the neighbourhood around me make my one source of delight....I live close to the open fields, have gardens in front of my windows and a hill with oak trees, and scarce a couple of steps take me into a beautiful vale of meadowland. Thither I go forth, then, when I am weary of my work, climb up the hill, sit me down in the sunshine and look away beyond Frankfort into the far distances, and so these innocent moments give me back courage and strength to live and toil. Dear Sister! It is as good as though one had been in church, when one has thus felt with pure heart and open eye light and air and the lovely earth' (Letter to his sister Heinrike, early in 1799).

Surely the poet's eye dwelt long on Frankfort's towers before it sought the distance. Parted from Diotima only by those few miles of country he could still write to her and may perhaps have had meetings with her, though this is now uncertain. Her picture, we know, was indelibly imprinted on his mind. The parting from Frankfort, says Dilthey, 'was a new and hard experience that set him apart from life and his fellow-men. "Mit einer furchtbaren Ausschlieszlichkeit" his gaze remained henceforth unalterably fixed upon the holy thing that had appeared to him in Diotima. No everyday circumstance of life had any value for him henceforth. The dangerous separation of his real life from his ideal dream became complete in this hour[1].' Of this we have evidence in those few precious letters or drafts of letters exchanged or meant for exchange between the lovers. They bear out too the words of Marie Joachimi-Dege, 'the hopelessness of this love and the inward loneliness remained for both and grew perforce ever more acute.' Characteristically Frau Gontard was quicker to realise this than was her dreamy lover. One fragment we possess dates from the end of June 1799. In it the disheartened poet pitifully contrasts his own poverty of soul with the glory of 'great men,' his mind doubtless running upon Empedocles and other heroes of antiquity with whom he now above all sought familiar converse. The text, which we owe to Böhm's researches, demands translation in full:

'Day after day I must call back the vanished divinity. When I think about great men, in great times, and how, a sacred fire, they seized on all around them, and changed all that was dead, wooden, the world's straw, into flames, and the world blazed up with them to heaven, —and then on myself, how often I go about, a little glimmering lamp, ready to beg one drop of oil, so as to shine a while still through the night, lo! there passes a shuddering through all my limbs, and in a whisper I call out to myself a terrible word: "Dead, thou art dead in life!"

Do you know why it is? Men fear one another, fear lest the genius of one should eat up the other and therefore they grudge each other, not indeed food and drink, but all that nourishes the soul, and cannot endure it, when something they say and do is seized on by others for spiritual food and changed into flame. The fools! As though anything at all that men could say to one another were aught but firewood, that

[1] Yet, as Adolf Wilbrandt pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 31), to have remained at Frankfort, in the circumstances, would have destroyed 'the remnant of his spiritual powers.' 'Flight alone made it possible for him to pull himself together through the act of resignation.'

only when it is seized by the spiritual fire turns into fire again, even as it went forth out of life and fire. And do they but grant each other the right to nourish themselves from each other's store, then both of them live and give light and neither eats up the other.'

The foregoing paragraph probably refers to the anxieties arising from his plan to start a journal, to which reference will be made later. But the end of the letter takes on a lyrical note of remembered joy:

'Do you recall our untroubled hours, when we and we alone were close to one another?—That was triumph! Both so free and proud and alive in the bloom and glory of spirit and heart and eye and visage, and both in such heavenly peace beside one another! Did I not even then guess it and say it: "one might wander the whole world over and hardly find such a thing again." And every day I feel it deeper and deeper.'

It seems that this fragment was not sent; perhaps Hölderlin dared not reveal so much of his feelings. Another fragment written in these days met the same fate. It ends thus:

'Moments of joy I still have, it is true. But can that replace a world of them? And this it is that makes me true to you forever. This person and that have many an excellent point. But a nature like yours in which all is so united in one inward indissoluble living bond, this is the pearl of the age, and whoever has recognised it, and how its heavenly, inborn, peculiar happiness is also at the same time its deep unhappiness, he too is forever happy and forever unhappy.'

A few months after leaving Frankfort Hölderlin was able to send Frau Gontard his completed *Hyperion*, writing in it the touching words: 'To whom else but to thee?' With the book went, or was to go, another letter of which we also have the draft[1]. Of still higher value is the letter from Diotima which was once read by Chr. Schwab and of which W. Böhm has rediscovered a draft for the genuineness of which he vouches. His authority may be accepted: the letter itself bears the stamp we should expect to find. It is the letter of a high-souled, clear-eyed woman, in whom deep affection has not blinded but sharpened the vision. These two letters must be given in full:

'Herewith our Hyperion, Dear!' writes the poet. 'After all, this fruit of our soul-full days will give you some little pleasure. Forgive me for letting Diotima die. You remember, we could never quite agree about this in those days. I considered it necessary in view of the whole

[1] W. Böhm dates it 'about Easter 1799,' thus making it the *first* of our three fragments.

situation. Dearest! All that is said here and there of her and of us, of the life of our life, take it as a sort of thanks that is ofttimes all the truer, the less skilfully it is expressed. Had I been able at your feet step by step to form myself into an artist in peace and freedom, verily I believe I should have become one, and my heart yearns after this in all sorrow with tears and in the broad light of day and often in unspoken desperation. Truly it is cause enough for all the tears we have wept for years that we should not have the joy that we can give one another, but the wrong cries out to Heaven, if we must think that we two must go under with all our powers at their best, because we are kept apart. And see, that makes me many a time so silent, because I must beware of such thoughts. Your sickness, your letter—it came so clear before my eyes, for all that I blind them to it at other times, that you are suffering, always suffering—and I, boy that I am, can only weep over it! Which is better, tell me, that we hold our peace about what is in our hearts, or that we tell it to one another? Always I have played the coward, to spare you,—have always acted as though I could put up with everything, as though I had simply been a ball made for men and circumstances to kick about, and had no stout heart in me beating, dearest life, steadfast and free in its own right for the best that was in it; have often refused and denied to myself my own dear love and the very thought of you: wholly and solely that for your sake I might live through this fate as peacefully as possible. You too, you have continually fought, peaceful one! in order to have peace, have with heroic strength suffered and kept silent about what could not be changed, have hid away and buried the eternal choice of your heart, and hence it comes that there is so often darkness before our eyes, and we no longer know what we are and have, scarcely recognise ourselves any longer; this everlasting struggle and contradiction within the heart, assuredly this must slowly kill you, and if no God can quiet it there, I too have no choice but to kill myself with care for you and me, or else to regard nothing else but you, and with you to seek a way that will end the struggle for us.

I have before now thought that we too could live on self-denial, that perhaps it would make us strong too to say goodbye to hope,.....'

The sentence was, it may be, never finished. There is no more writing save, upon the back of the sheet, the cry of resignation

Pure, to be pure in heart,
This is the highest
Wise men have conceived,
Wiser men wrought.

Diotima answered[1] with strong words of comfort that reveal much of her deep hold upon the poet. She was riper in experience, calmer, and therefore stronger than her romantic lover. So she realised, as he did not, that their present task was to turn their eyes away from a love which could only exist in dreams and cut off the dreamers from their true relations to life. Here is the fragment that has been saved:

[‘Frankfort o. M., September 1799.]

.....The more one has to say, the less one can say. Send me the Hyperion by Sinclair: it is impossible for me to buy it for money[2]. I would like to dream forever, yet dreaming is self-destruction and self-destruction is cowardice. Love is a relation that exists in the world of reality that surrounds us, not in the spirit alone, the senses too (not sensuality) belong to it; yes, love that we remove altogether from reality and feel only in the spirit, love to which we could give no nourishment and no hope, would in the end become a mere dreaming or it would vanish from before us, it would remain, but we would know it no more and its beneficial influence upon our hearts would cease. I feel that our love is too holy for me to deceive you.

The passion of the highest love assuredly never finds its satisfaction upon earth, feel it with me, this search for it would be folly; to die with one another—but silence, it sounds like visionary romanticism, and yet is so true—is the satisfaction. It is easy for men to let live what they do not in reality care about; it is only what they can envy that they would like to destroy[3].’

So without many words, she turns aside to a practical matter and sends the poet a significant warning not to fall under the paralysing influence of Schiller’s overwhelming personality:

‘Do not return to the place whence with torn feelings you came for shelter to my arms. I must confess it to you; it frightened me a little, your writing to me you intended in a certain event to follow the advice and decision of Schiller. Will he not seek to bring you into his own neighbourhood? Will not this flattering call simply lead you into the wrong path? If it should hereafter prove so, oh, then think of our love and its countless miseries!

[1] It is not clear to which letter of Hölderlin’s this is the answer. W. Böhm dates the Diotima-fragment variously September (in the text) and August (in the introduction to his selection of letters). Hölderlin’s last fragment (see pp. 204 ff.) he regards as the answer to this of Diotima.

[2] The copy sent by Hölderlin had not yet reached her.

[3] The writer means, ‘We must go on living as a duty, and men can do no great harm to us *now*.’

Schiller—assuredly you could not avoid going to him, very likely it would be extremely pleasant for you, and what sentiments I should have in that case, I felt clearly enough from the beating of my heart, when I passed a few hours in that house, a house in Weimar bei Jena, which Schiller was about to remove into.—I know well, such weaknesses are folly in sight of love's high ideal and deserve condemnation, but yet in our human sense of love! Have a care, you understand me! The influence of noble natures is as necessary to the artist, as is the light of day to the plants, and just as the light of day is reflected in the plant, not as it is in itself, but only in the many-hued, earthly play of colours, so noble natures do not find themselves, but scattered traces of their own excellence, in the manifold creations and plays of the artists....'

In the vagueness of the warning is reflected the trouble of Diotima's foreboding. Too proud to conceal her jealousy of Schiller's power she feared too much ill from his influence over her lover's development as a poet to be able to keep back the dark but pregnant warning. No man —least of all Hölderlin—could forget such a woman's love. Yet she was right when she bade him make the effort, right too when she feared that his nature might be swallowed up by a stronger than itself. Self-destructive dreaminess was his most immediate danger, and, next to this, self-contemptuous relaxation of the effort to express himself. His salvation lay only in his passion for his own poetry. For the present he remained at Homburg, and in toiling at his drama, *The Death of Empedocles*, sought the anodyne he must have if he were not to dream himself into utter 'other-worldliness' and euthanasia. To his love-poems was added in the last months at Homburg[1] the priceless *Complaint of Menon for Diotima*, in which Menon's spirit is shown wandering restlessly over hill and dale, by the springs and through the woods, in search of rest, like the wounded stag that flees into the thicket, uttering its mournful cry and pierced through with the dart:

> Thus, O ye dear ones! I seem to myself, but, ah! is there no man
> Who will have pity and lift from my brow the sorrowful dreaming?

This 'sorrowful dreaming' lay henceforth always over his eyes, but as yet it rarely found expression. He wrote many letters to his family, but spoke only in the vaguest terms of his inward 'sufferings,' though he confessed later to having been attacked by 'a sickliness that lasted almost the whole winter and a part of the summer too.' In the effort to forget and in the passionate desire to use his brief spell of independ-

[1] It was perhaps not finished, but part of it at least was written there.

ence to the full he had overworked himself, and at the same time he had both underfed himself and gone without necessary warmth, this last on account of the 'enormously high price of wood.' In Frankfort he had saved up 500 fl. and thought himself thus 'economically secure for at least a year.' But he had not counted on sickness; by April, 1799, he was obliged to think of accepting from his anxious mother 100 gulden—to be regarded simply as a loan. He had just received a notable encouragement. A. W. Schlegel, reviewing Neuffer's *Taschenbuch für* 1799 in the *Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, had singled out Hölderlin's contributions as alone worthy of praise and 'full of soul and spirit.' The critic further wished him good luck with his promised 'longer poem' (*Empedocles*) to which Hölderlin had referred, in the touching lines *An die Parzen* which I must quote in the original:

> Nur *einen* Sommer gönnt, ihr Gewaltigen!
> Und *einen* Herbst zu reifem Gesange mir,
> Dasz williger mein Herz, vom süszen
> Spiele gesättiget, dann mir sterbe!
>
> Die Seele, der im Leben ihr göttlich Recht
> Nicht ward, sie ruht auch drunten im Orkus nicht;
> Doch ist mir einst das Heil'ge, das am
> Herzen mir liegt, das Gedicht, gelungen:
>
> Willkommen dann, O Stille der Schattenwelt!
> Zufrieden bin ich, wenn auch mein Saitenspiel
> Mich nicht hinabgeleitet; *einmal*
> Lebt' ich, wie Götter, und mehr bedarf's nicht.

Slowly his health returned and his spirits improved again. 'Once more,' he writes, 'I have grown young again with the spring, and I look out upon life with new courage and new strength. Insolent, impatient, immodest I never can and never will again become towards Him who guides my fate.'

But something had to be done and that quickly if he was to hold out in Homburg. In June 1799, he revealed to Neuffer a new project in which he showed himself once again a singular optimist. 'I have in mind to bring out a poetical monthly;.....the first numbers will include a tragedy of mine, The Death of Empedocles, which I have finished, all but the last act....' The contents were to be 'aesthetic' and to appeal, in the main, to ladies. Every month were to appear some four sheets, or 64 pages, octavo, 'not too closely printed.' 'I shall take care that every annual volume, so far as possible, includes at least one complete poetical work of considerable length, for example, a tragedy or a novel, etc.' He hoped for contributions from Heinse, Bouterwek, Matthisson, Conz Siegfried Schmid and Neuffer himself. The latter's friend, Steinkopf

of Stuttgart, was induced to act as publisher[1], but on reflection demanded a stronger list of contributors, including Goethe, Humboldt, Fichte and Schelling. Hölderlin only knew one great author intimately, and to him he turned once more in the hour of his need. In spite of Diotima's warning some fatal instinct seems to have drawn Hölderlin irresistibly towards the one man who seemed still to have the power, if only he had the will, to establish his younger fellow-poet firmly beyond the fear of hungering for bread.

Even while at Frankfort he had sent Schiller several poems, not all of which were accepted, for the more the younger poet developed his own style the less it appealed to the elder. Schiller, no longer clear about his protégé's genius, had returned some well-meant advice without seeing that Hölderlin had ceased to follow in his steps. On July 5, 1799, the would-be editor again appealed to him, in a rather painfully formal and apologetic letter, 'with the immodest request' for a few contributions to his projected 'humanistischen Journale.' In an even more laborious letter he made the same request of Schelling, harping in what he himself calls a 'clumsy introduction' upon the fact that the new journal would take up the 'standpoint of the so-called humanism.' Schelling answered that he could only offer some 'lecture-notebooks.' Schiller eventually ([Aug. ?] 24, 1799) replied that he would very gladly help, if he were not himself so excessively busy, and proceeded to warn his countryman against carrying out the project. His own sixteen years of editing periodicals had been so 'little favourable' that he could not 'as an honest friend' advise Hölderlin to try his luck. He would gladly help with more than mere advice, he said, in closing a rather brief letter, and would be 'in a better position to make some proposal,' if Hölderlin would 'inform him more clearly of his present position.'

The latter summoned all his courage to meet this blow which was fatal to the unborn journal. In his letter to Diotima—it is the last fragment of their correspondence we possess—he revealed the whole bitter truth to the one being who would give him complete sympathy:

[Homburg, September[2], 1799.]

Dearest!

The uncertainty of my affairs was the sole cause of my not writing before. The project of the journal, about which I wrote you

[1] One learns with astonishment that Hölderlin had so far overrated his own powers of production as to offer to supply Steinkopf's *Damenkalender* with at least four sheets (64 pp.) every year without payment!

[2] All the internal evidence points to September as the month of writing. Taking July 5 as the beginning of the two months lost in preparations we reach the *first week* in September. Cf. p. 205, note 4.

previously, not without good grounds, with so much confidence, seems to me on the verge of shipwreck. I had counted on it with so much hope for my influence and my sustenance and my being able to remain there[1] in your neighbourhood; and now I have had to experience a great many unpleasant truths in addition to seeing all my trouble and all my hopes come to nothing. I had made a safe, unassuming plan; my publisher would have something more brilliant; I was to engage a number of famous writers, who he imagined were friends of mine, as contributors, and although I guessed at once that no good would come of this attempt, I was fool enough to let myself be persuaded, in order not to appear too stubborn, and so my kind heart, that will be trying to please everyone, has brought me into a quandary of which I am sorry to say I must write you, because my future position, that is to say, practically, the life I live for your sake, probably depends upon it. Not only men of whom I was rather the admirer than the friend, but friends too, Dear, and among them some who could not refuse me a certain amount of assistance without real ingratitude—have left me up to now —without answer, and I have been living now fully eight weeks in this state of waiting and hoping, my existence all the time more or less hanging in the balance. What the cause of this reception may be, God alone knows. Are people so utterly ashamed of me?

Yet that this can in reason scarcely be the case is proved to me by your judgment, noble lady, and by the judgment of some few who have remained faithful to me and stood by me in my difficulty, for example, Jung in Mainz, whose letter I enclose. Only the famous, whose assistance was to serve poor, *un*famous me as a shield[2], the famous turned a deaf ear to me, and why should they not? Everyone that makes himself a name in the world seems indeed to take away some portion of their glory; they are no longer the one and only gods; in short, it seems to me that a certain amount of trade-jealousy is mixed up with their feelings, for they are human like myself, I imagine[3]. But it does not help me much to realise this. I have lost nearly two months over preparations for the journal.....[4].

[1] 'für...meinen *dortigen* Aufenthalt.' The adjective is curious; why not 'hiesigen'? There seems no room for doubt that Hölderlin was writing from Homburg.

[2] Or the words ('zum Schilde') may mean 'like (an attractive) sign (on a modest inn).'

[3] This would seem to give the sense of the phrase, 'bei ihnen, die ich mir ungefähr als meinesgleichen denken darf.'

[4] The words omitted state his intention to ask Steinkopf to take what he had prepared for the Journal and publish it in another form. The statement is important for the dating of the fragment, a fact which has, I think, escaped notice. On October 8 Hölderlin wrote to his mother that, while he had given up 'die eigentliche Herausgabe und ganze Besorgung

And so then I have in mind to devote all the time that still remains to me to my tragedy: that will probably be a quarter of a year or so, and then I must go home or to some place where I can support myself by means of private lectures or other subsidiary occupations, since there is no hope of doing so here.

Forgive me, Dearest, this straightforward language! It would only have been harder for me than telling you what was absolutely necessary, if I had given utterance to that which my heart expresses toward you, Dear; and it is, too, nearly impossible in a fate like mine to preserve the needful courage without thereby momentarily losing the tender tones of the innermost life. It was just for this reason that I wrote hitherto.....'

The end of this fragment is missing and we have no other, though we know that the poet never ceased to cherish in his mind the image of the woman he had so intimately loved and who had so nobly and purely returned his affection. From this time until the end of his life he had, so far as we know the facts, no further direct communications with her. There is no room here to trace the last faltering steps of his way down to mental darkness. It remains only to state clearly the fact that Hölderlin's passion for Diotima had very little to do with his unhappy end. His insanity, of which the first symptoms occurred in 1801, was due, according to the most recent pathological inquiry, to what one may call purely physical causes. Like Lenz, Hölderlin fell a victim to 'dementia praecox catatonica,' a kind of sudden mental decay which attacks patients of all classes and antecedents about the age of 25—30 and is not materially affected by their previous mental experiences. Windelband's theory that Hölderlin's downfall was due to his failure to reconcile the complications of modern life with the beautiful simplicity of his idealised Greek world must also give way to the more sober explanation of modern science.

Once more, the story that Hölderlin's sudden departure from Bordeaux was occasioned by the news of Diotima's death must be relegated to the limbo of fables, as indeed C. C. T. Litzmann pointed out in 1890[1]. On June 30, 1802, Sinclair wrote to Hölderlin,

des Journals,' his 'Buchhändler' was to pay him 11 fl. a sheet, 'wenn er Lust hat, meine Beiträge zu dem Journale nach einiger Zeit besonders zu drucken und herauszugeben.' It would seem that Hölderlin had written to Steinkopf and received his answer since penning the fragment to Diotima. This correspondence might easily have occupied three to four weeks.

[1] The story is repeated, with dates to suit, in the latest edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1910). Yet Litzmann's *Life of Hölderlin* appears in the bibliographical note to the article.

'On the 22nd of this month (Frau) G(ontard) died of the (German) measles, on the tenth day of her illness.' Hölderlin, however, as Litzmann proved from his passport, left Bordeaux on May 10, 1802, and had reached Straszburg by June 7. Where and when he heard of Diotima's death we have no means of knowing. Nor does it greatly matter, for he was already, to some extent at least, out of his mind. Waiblinger records that he never spoke in later years of Frankfort or of Diotima; nor would he listen to questions about them. The subjects were too painful; any mention of either excited him dreadfully for days together. Once he brought himself to begin an *Ode to Diotima*; of this Waiblinger printed four pathetic lines which we may quote in conclusion and leave without comment to tell their own tale:

An Diotima.

Wenn aus der Ferne, da wir geschieden sind[,]
ich Dir noch kennbar bin, Dir Vergangenheit,
o Du Theilhaber meiner Schmerzen,
einiges Gute bezeichnen Dir kann....

Marshall Montgomery.

Giessen.

THE S. PANTALEO TEXT OF DANTE'S LETTERS TO THE EMPEROR HENRY VII, AND TO THE PRINCES AND PEOPLES OF ITALY.

§ I.

SINCE my previous article[1] was printed I have received photographic reproductions of the Latin text of Dante's letters to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII), and to the Princes and Peoples of Italy (*Epist.* V), as contained in the S. Pantaleo MS. (*Cod. S. Pantaleo* 8), a fourteenth century MS.[2], in the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome. This MS. also contains the text of the early Italian translation, attributed to Marsilio Ficino, of the letter to the Emperor, which has been preserved in a number of other MSS. The Latin text of this letter is preserved in two other MSS., namely the Vatican MS. (*Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat.* 1729), of the fourteenth century, and a Venetian MS. (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115), of the fifteenth. The Latin text of the letter to the Princes and Peoples of Italy is preserved in one other MS. only, the Vatican MS. aforesaid, in which, however, there are numerous more or less considerable hiatus.

A transcript of the Vatican text of these two letters, with variant readings from the various printed editions, and, in the case of *Epistola* VII, from the Venetian MS., was printed in the article referred to above. As the S. Pantaleo text has never been printed, nor even collated by the editors of Dante's letters[3], I now subjoin a transcript, with an *apparatus*

[1] *The Vatican Text* (*Cod. Vat.-Palat. Lat.* 1729) *of the Letters of Dante*, in *Modern Language Review*, VII, 1—39.

[2] See Barbi, in *Bull. Soc. Dant. Ital.* N.S. II, 23. It probably belongs to the latter half of the fourteenth century. Colomb de Batines, who describes the MS. in his *Bibliografia Dantesca* (II, 208—9), assigns it to the first half of the fifteenth century. Besides the letters of Dante above mentioned this MS., which belonged at one time to Celso Cittadini (1555—1627), contains the text of the *Divina Commedia*, lyrical poems of Dante and Guido Cavalcanti, and other matter (see De Batines, *loc. cit.*).

[3] Since this was written I have seen a notice in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* (N.S. XVII, 77—9) of an article by P. Wagner on *Die Echtheit der drei Kaiserbriefe Dantes im Lichte der Kritik*, in which an account is given of the three MSS. (including the S. Pantaleo MS.) containing the text of *Epist.* VII. I have been unable as yet to obtain a copy of this article.

criticus, in which are registered variants, in the case of *Epistola* VII, from the Vatican and Venetian MSS.; and, in the case of *Epistola* V, from the Vatican MS., in which, as already stated, the text is incomplete. I have appended a list of proposed emendations in the Oxford text[1] of these letters, in addition to (or, in one or two cases, in substitution of) those printed in the previous article.

As in the transcript of the Vatican text, the contractions of the MS. have been expanded, the expansions being printed in italics. The 'punctuation' of the MS., which, as often, is more or less haphazard, has been preserved, so far as it has been possible to distinguish it in the reproduction. The folios of the MS. [140ro—143vo] are indicated in the transcript; as are the lines (numbered in round brackets) of each separate folio. For convenience of reference each letter, as before, has been broken up into sections, numbered [in square brackets] to correspond with the numbering of those in the Oxford Dante; and the titles, which in both letters are written continuously with the text in the MS., have been detached and printed as separate paragraphs.

§ II.

Epistola VII (To the Emperor Henry VII).

In the MS. the title of this letter, consisting of four lines all but one word, begins at l. 4 of fol. 140ro, ll. 1—3 being occupied by the colophon of the Italian translation. The text of the letter immediately follows the title, without a break, at the end of l. 7, and ends in the middle of l. 30 of fol. 141vo. The colophon, which begins a fresh line, occupies ll. 31—2 of the same fol.

In the *apparatus criticus* Vat. indicates the Vatican MS., Ven. the Venetian MS., and Ital. the Italian translation contained in this MS.

(4) Gloriosissimo atq*ue* felicissimo Triumphator*j*[2] / *et* dom*i*no sing*u*lari dom*i*no Henricho[3] (5) diuina p*r*ouidentia Romanor*um* Regj[4] / *et* senp*er* Augusto deuotissimj suj (6) Dantes alagh*erii*[5] Florentinus / *et* exul inmeritus / ac vniu*er*saliter omn*es* (7) Tuscj[6] / quj pacem desciderant / terre obsculum ante pedes.

[1] In my previous article (*M.L.R.* VII, 4) I spoke of the Oxford text of the letters of Dante as 'the latest.' My attention has since been drawn to the edition published at Florence in 1910 by Sansoni, under the editorship of G. L. Passerini. Some remarks on this edition will be found in the *Addenda* at the end of the present article.

[2] Ven. *Sanctissimo T.*; in Vat. the title is wanting; Ital. *Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo triunfactore.*

[3] Ven. *Henrico.* [4] Ven. *rege.* [5] Ven. *Aldigherij.* [6] Ven. *Thusci.*

[§ 1.] Inmensa (8) dej dilectione testante / relicta nobis est[1] pacis hereditas / ut in sua (9) mira dulcedine / militie nostre dura mitescerent / *et* in vsu eius (10) patrie triumphantis[2] gaudia mererem*ur*. At liuor antiqui *et* inpla-(11)-cabilis hostis / humane prosperitatj semper *et* latenter[3] insidians / non (12) nullos hexeredando uolentes / ob tutoris absemtiam nos[4] alios impie[5] (13) denudare[6] inuitos. Hinc diu super[7] Flumina confuxionis deflevimus / et (14) patrocinia iustj regis incessanter[8] implorabamus[9] / quj[10] satillitium seuj (15) tyrannj disperderet / *et* nos in nostra iustitia reformaret. Cumque tu (16) cesaris *et* Agustj successor / Apenninj juga transiliens veneran-(17)-da singna tarpeia[11] retulistj / protinus longa substiterunt suspiria / (18) lacrimarum/que diluuia[12] desierunt / *et* ceu titan preoptatus[13] exoriens / (19) noua spes latio seculj melioris effulxit. Tunc plerique vota (20) sua preuenientes in iubilo / tam saturnia rengna / quam virginem rede-(21)-untem / cum marone cantabant.

[§ 2.] Verum quia sol noster siue de-(22)-sciderij feruor hoc summoneat[14] / siue faties veritatis / aut morarj (23) jam creditur aut retrocedere subputatur / quasj Iosue denuo uel (24) amos filius jmperaret / Incertitudine[15] dubitare compellimur / et [fol. 140vo] in vocem precursoris irrumpere / sic tu es qui venturus es[16] / an alium expec-(2)-tamus. Et quamuis longa sitis / in dubium que sunt certa / propter esse propinqua / (3) ut assolet furibunda deflectat / nichilomjnus jnte[17] credimus *et* speramus / (4) asseuerantes te dej[18] ministrum / *et* ecclesie filium / *et* Romane (5) glorie promotorem. Nam *et* ego quj scribo tam pro me / quam pro alijs (6) uelut[19] decet / Imperatoriam maiestatem / benignissimum vidj *et* (7) clementissimum te audiuj / cum pedes tuos / manus uitas[20] tracta-(8)-runt / *et* labia mea debitum persoluerunt / Cum[21] exultauit in me (9) spiritus meus cum tacitus dixj mecum / ecce angnus dej / ecce (10) qui tollis[22] peccata mundj.

[§ 3.] Set quid tam sera moretur segnities (11) admiramur / quando jam victor / in ualle victor Heridianj[23] / non secus (12) tussciam derelinquis / pretermictis *et* negligis / quam si vita[24] tutanda[25] (13) jmperij

[1] Vat. *est nobis.* [2] Ven. *triumphis.*
[3] Vat. *latanter*; Ven. *conlatenter.* [4] Vat. *non.*
[5] Vat. *impios*; Ital. *crudelmente.* [6] Vat. Ven. *denudauit*; Ital. *spollio*
[7] Ven. *semper.* [8] Vat. *incensanter.* [9] Ven. *imploraauimus.*
[10] Ven. *et qui.* [11] Ven. *turpia.* [12] Ven. *diluuię.*
[13] Ven. *precipitatus*; Ital. *innanzi desiato.*
[14] Vat. *summoueat*; Ven. *submoueat*; Ital. *admonischa.* [15] Vat. *in certitudine.*
[16] Inserted above the line. [17] *Sic.* [18] Vat. omits *dei.*
[19] Ven. *uel.* [20] So apparently MS.; above is written *alias meas*; Vat. Ven. *mee.*
[21] Vat. *tunc.* [22] Vat. Ven. *tollit.*
[23] Vat. Ven. *iam dudum in ualle uictor heridani.* [24] Vat. Ven. *iura.*
[25] Ven. *tuendi.*

circumscribj ligine*r*anj[1] finib*us* arbitreris. Non p*ro*rsus ut (14) suspicam*ur* adue*r*teris[2] q*uoni*am romanor*um* glor*i*osa potes*t*as / nec metis ytalie (15) nec tricornis[3] europe margine cohartat*ur*. Nam *et* si vim passa / in (16) augustum[4] / gubernac*u*la sua *con*traxerit[5]. vndique tam*en* de inuiolabilj ju*re* (17) fluctus amphytretis[6] attingens[7] / vix ab inutilj vnda occeanj se (18) circu*m*cingj dingnat*ur*. Scriptum *et* enim nobis est / Nascet*ur*[8] pul-(19)-cra troianus origine cesar. Imperij[9] occeano famam q*ui* ter*m*inet (20) astris. Et cum vniu*er*saliter orbem describj edixisset aug*ust*us ut (21) bos n*oste*r euangliczans / accensus ingnis eternj[10] flam*m*a remigit[11] / (22) si non de iustissimj principatus aula p*ro*disset[12] edictum vnige-(23)-nitus dej filius / homo factus / ad[13] p*ro*-fitendum[14] *secundu*m *natu*ram assu*m*p-(24)-tam / edicto[15] se subditum / nequaquam tu*n*c nassej de virgine (25) uoluisset. Non enim suasisset in iustum[16] / quem om*n*em iustitia*m* (26) implere decebat[17].

[§ 4.] Pudeat itaq*ue* in angustissima[18] mundj (27) area irretirj[19] / tam diu quem mundus om*n*is expectat / *et* ab (28) augus*ti*[20] circum-spectione non defluat q*uod* Tuschana[21] tyra*n*nis in (29) dilat*ion*is fidutia confortat*ur* *et*[22] cotidie malignan*t*ium coartan*d*o[23] (30) sup*er*biam / vires nouas accumulat temeritatem temeritatj (31) adiciens. Intonet iter*um*[24] / vox[25] illa curionis in cesarem. / Dum [fol. 141ro] trepidant[26] nullo firmmte[27] robore partes. Tolle moras semper nocuit[28] dif-(2)-ferre paratis. Par labor at q*ue* metus[29] pretio maiore petuntur. (3) Intonet[30] illa vox increpitantis a nubib*us*[31] iter*um*[32] in enea*m*. Si[33] te nul-(4)-la mouet

[1] So apparently MS.; Vat. Ven. *ligurum*; Ital. *lombardia*.
[2] Vat. Ven. *aduertens*. [3] Ven. *iriconis*.
[4] Vat. *non Augustum*; Ven. *in Augustum*; Ital. *in strectecza*.
[5] Ven. *contraxit*. [6] Vat. *amphitritis*; Ven. *Amphitricis*. [7] Vat. *attigens*.
[8] Vat. *Scriptum etenim uobis est nascetur*; Ven. *Scriptum est enim nascetur*; on the margin of our MS. is the reference .·. *Virgilius in vj eneydos*; the first word of each line of the quotation is preceded by ⊂ to indicate that it is a quotation.
[9] Vat. Ven. *Imperium*. [10] Ven. omits *eterni*. [11] Vat. Ven. *remugit*.
[12] Vat. Ven. *prodiisset*. [13] Ven. *factus qui ad*.
[14] Ven. *proficendum*. [15] Ven. *edicit*. [16] Vat. Ven. *iniustum*.
[17] Ven. *qui omnem iusticiam implere debebat*. [18] Ven. *angusta*.
[19] Ven. *metiri*. [20] Ven. *augusta*. [21] Vat. Ven. *Tuscana*.
[22] Ven. *ut*. [23] Vat. *cohortando*; Ven. *cohartando*.
[24] Ven. *igitur*; Ital. *un altra uolta*. [25] Ven. *uos*.
[26] On the margin is the reference .·. *Lucanus in primo libro*; the first word of each line of the quotation is preceded by ⊂ as before.
[27] So apparently MS.; Vat. *firmate*; Ven. *firmari*.
[28] Ven. *nocuit semper*. [29] Ven. *mętas*.
[30] *Intonet* is preceded by ⊂ as if it and the following words were part of the quotation.
[31] Vat. *a nubis*; Ven. *Annubis*; Ital. *descesa del cielo**.
[32] Ven. omits *iterum*.
[33] In the margin is the reference .·. *Virgilius in iiij Eneydos*; each line of the quotation being indicated by ⊂ as before.

* On the question as to whether the correct reading is *Anubis* or *a nubibus* here, see my article in the *Bulletin Italien*, XII, 1—5 (Janv.—Mars, 1912).

tantar*um* glor*ia* rer*um*. Nec sup*er* ipsa tua moliris[1] laude (5) laborem. Asscanium surgentem *et* spes her*e*dis Iulij[2] Respice Cui ren-(6)-gnum[3] ytalie romanaq*ue* tellus[4]. Debentur *etcetera*[5].

[§ 5.] Ioh*annes* namq*ue* regius pr*i*moge-(7)-nitus tuus / *et* rex quem post diej orientis occasum mundi successiua (8) posteritas prestolatur[6] / Nobis est alter aschanus[7] / quj vestigiam[8] m*an*-(9)-gni genitor*is* obs*er*uans in turnos / vbique sicud leo deseuiet *et* in la-(10)-tinos[9] uelud angnus[10] mitesscet. Precaueant sacratissimj regis alta *con*sci-(11)-lia / ne celeste iuditium / samuelis illa uerba reasper*e*t. Non ne cum par-(12)-uulus esses[11] in oculis tuis / capud in tribub*us*[12] ysr*ae*l fact*us* es / vnxit q*ue* te (13) d*omi*nus in regem / et[13] mixit te d*omi*nus[14] in viam[15] *et* ayt / vade *et* interfice (14) p*eccat*ores Amalech. Nam *et* tu in regem sacratus es / ut Amalech p*er*-(15)-cutias[16] / Agag[17] non parcas[18] / at q*ue* ulciscaris illum quj misit te de (16) gente brutali[19] / *et* de festina sua solle*m*pnitate / que q*uid*em *et* amalech (17) et agag[20] sonar*e* dicunt*ur*.

[§ 6.] Tu mediolanj tam u*er*nando q*uam* yemando (18) moraris / *et* ydram pestiferam p*er* capitum amputat*i*onem veris[21] (19) extinguere / q*uod* si[22] mangnalia glor*i*ose alcide[23] recensuisses / te ut illu*m* (20) falli *con*gnoscer*es*[24] cuj pestilens an*i*mal capite repullulante[25] multiplicj (21) p*er* dampnum cresscebat / donec instant*er* mangnanim*us*[26] / vite pr*in*cip*ium* (22) jmpetiuit. Non et enim[27] ad arbor*es* extirpendas[28] / ualet ipsa ramor*um*[29] (23) incisio / q*uin* iter*um* multiplicius virulente[30] ramificent[31] / quo usq*ue* ra-(24)-dices incolumes fuerint ut prebeant alim*en*tum. Quid preses[32] (25) unice mundj p*er*egisse preconijcis[33] / cum ceruicem cremone de-(26)-flexeris *con*tumacis / Non ne tu*n*c u*el* Brissie[34] u*el* Papie rabies (27) in opina[35] turgescet. Inmo que cum etiam flagellata[36] resederit (28) mox alia / Vercellis u*el* Pergamj / u*el* alibj returgebit /

[1] Vat. *molitis*.
[2] Vat. Ven. *Iuli*.
[3] Vat. *regimen*.
[4] Vat. Ven. *regna*.
[5] Vat. Ven. omit *etcetera*.
[6] Ven. *prosteritas prestoletur*.
[7] *Sic*.
[8] *Sic*; Vat. Ven. *uestigia*.
[9] Ven. *latino*.
[10] Vat. *agnos*.
[11] Vat. *esset*.
[12] Ven. *tribus*.
[13] Vat. *unxit que te dominus in Regem super israel et*; Ven. *unxitque deus in regem et*.
[14] Vat. Ven. *deus*.
[15] Vat. *uia*.
[16] Vat. *percuciens*.
[17] Vat. *ut agag*; Ven. *et Agagi*.
[18] Ven. *parcas minime*.
[19] Ven. *de gente in gentem brath bratali*.
[20] Ven. *Agagi*.
[21] Vat. Ven. *reris*.
[22] Vat. *quia si*.
[23] Vat. *gloriosi alcide*; Ven. *gloriose alcidę*.
[24] Ven. *cognosceris*.
[25] Ven. *repupulare*.
[26] Ven. *magnanimis*.
[27] Ven. *Non enim*.
[28] Vat. Ven. *extirpandas*.
[29] Ven. *Romanorum*.
[30] Vat. *uirulenter*; Ven. *uia terre*.
[31] Ven. *ramescent*.
[32] Ven. *qui prees*.
[33] Vat. *preconicis*; Ven. *preconiis*.
[34] Ven. *Nonne ut tuo vel tu brixię*.
[35] Vat. Ven. *inopina*.
[36] Ven. *flagellum*.

donec (29) huiusmodj scatescentie causa radicalis[1] tollatur / *et* radix[2] tantj erroris (30) euulsa cum trunco rami pungitiuj[3] arescant.

[§ 7.] An ingnoras ex-(31)-cellentissime[4] principum[5] / nec de specula[6] summe celsitudinis [fol. 141vo] deprehendis / vbi vulpecula fetoris istius venantium secura recumbat[7] / (2) quippe nec pado precipitj nec tiberj tuo criminosa potatur[8] / verum sarnj flu-(3)-enta torrentis ad huc ritus[9] eius inficiunt / *et* florentia[10] / forte nescis (4) dira hec pernities nuncupatur. Hec est vipera uersa in visscera genitricis / Hec (5) languida[11] pecus / que gregem dominj suj sua contagione conmaculat[12] / Hec (6) mirra scelestis *et* impia in amore patris[13] amplexus exestuans / Hec ama-(7)-ta jlla impatiens / que repulso fatalj connubio / quem fata[14] negabant (8) generum sibj adscire non timuit / set furialiter in bella uocauit[15] / *et* de-(9)-mum male ausa luendo laqueo se suspendit vere matrem viperea (10) feritate dilaniare contendit[16] / dum contra romam cornua rebellionis exa-(11)-cuit / que ad ymaginem suam at que similitudinem fecit illam vere fu-(12)-mos euaporante[17] sanie vitiantes exalat / *et* inde uicine[18] pecudes *et* inscie[19] (13) contabescunt / dum falsis illiciendo[20] blanditijs *et* figmentis / aggregat (14) sibj finitimos / *et* infatuant[21] aggregatos / vere in paternos ardet[22] ipsa con-(15)-cubitus / dum improba pro capacitate[23] conatur / Summi pontificis[24] quj pater (16) est patrum / aduersum te uiolare assensum[25]. Vere dej ordinationj resistit[26] / (17) proprie voluntatis[27] ydolum venerando / dum regem suum[28] aspernata legi-(18)-timum / non erubesscit insana / regi non suo / jura non sua / pro ma-(19)-le agendj[29] potestate pacisscj / set adtendat ad laqueum[30] mulier furi-(20)-ata quo se innectit / Nam sepe quis in reprobum sensum traditur / (21) ut traditus faciat ea que non[31] conueniunt que quamuis in iusta[32] sint opera / (22) iusta tamen supplicia esse noscuntur.

[1] Vat. *huius scatascentie causa radicalis*; Ven. *huiusmodi rabies*; Ital. *la radiceuole cagione di questo pizighore.*
[2] Vat. *tollatur et radice*; Ven. *tollatur radice.*
[3] Ven. *pugitiui.*
[4] Vat. *excellentissiue.*
[5] Ven. *principium.*
[6] Ven. *speculo.*
[7] Vat. *decumbat.*
[8] Ven. *potant.*
[9] Vat. Ven. *rictus.*
[10] Ven. *Florentiam.*
[11] Vat. *Hec est languida.*
[12] Vat. *pecus gregem domini sui sua contagione commaculans.*
[13] Vat. *in Cinare patris*; Ven. *in Cinere posita*; Ital. *nello amore del padre.*
[14] Ven. *quem semper.*
[15] Vat. *sed in bella furialiter prouocauit.*
[16] Ven. omits *luendo—contendit.*
[17] Ven. *fumo euaporantes.*
[18] Ven. *uicinię.*
[19] Ven. *uiscie.*
[20] Ven. *aliciendo.*
[21] Vat. *infatuat*; Ven. *insinuat*; Ital. *fa inpazare.*
[22] Ven. omits *ardet.*
[23] Vat. Ven. *improba procacitate*; Ital. *con maluagio uageiamento.*
[24] Ven. *summum pontificem.*
[25] Vat. *ascensum.*
[26] Ven. *restitit.*
[27] Ven. *uoluntati.*
[28] Vat. Ven. omit *suum.*
[29] Vat. *agenda*; Ven. *agende.*
[30] Ven. *accendit ad laqueum*; Ital. *adtende el laccio.*
[31] Ven. *etiam.*
[32] *Sic*; Vat. *iusta.*

[§ 8.] Eya itaque rumpe moras proles (23) altera[1] ysay / summe tibj fidutiam de oculis dominj dej sabaoth / coram quo (24) agis / *et* goliam[2] hunc / infunda[3] sapientie tue[4] at[5] in lapidem[6] virium tuarum (25) prosterne / quoniam jn eius occasu / vox[7] *et* umbra timoris castra filistinorum[8] (26) operiet / fugient filistey[9] / *et* liberabitur ysrael / Tunc hereditas nostra quam (27) sine intermissione deflemus ablatam / nobis erit in integrum re-(28)-stituta. At quemadmodum[10] sacro sancte jerusalem memores exules in ba-(29)-billone gemisscimus jta tunc ciues *et* respirantes in pace confuxionis (30) miserias[11] in gaudio re-colemus[12].

(31) Scriptum in Tuscia sub fonte sarni xv[a][13] kalendas maias / diuj fau-(32)-stissimj Herricj[14] cursus ad ytaliam Anno primo[15].

Proposed emendations[16] *in the Oxford text of Epist.* VII.

Title. *For* Sanctissimo triumphatori, *read* (*with MS.*) Gloriosissimo atque felicissimo t.[17]

l. 9. *For* impius, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) impie[18].

l. 106. *For* in via, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) in viam[19].

l. 138. *For* decumbat, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) recumbat.

l. 160. *For* alliciendo, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) illiciendo.

Colophon. *For* XIV Kal. Maias, *read* (*with MS. and Ven.*) XV Kal. Maias[20].

§ III.

Epistola V (*To the Princes and Peoples of Italy*).

In the MS. the title of this letter, which consists of three lines and one word, begins at the top of fol. 142ro. The text, which, as in the previous letter, immediately follows the title without a break, begins at the second word of l. 4, and ends in the middle of l. 7 of fol. 143vo. There is no colophon.

[1] Ven. *alta*; Ital. *secundo*.
[2] In MS. the *o* is superscript.
[3] *Sic*.
[4] Ven. *sue*.
[5] Vat. Ven. *atque*.
[6] Vat. Ven. *lapide*.
[7] Vat. *nox*; Ven. *nos*.
[8] Ven. *phylistinorum*.
[9] Ven. *philistei*.
[10] Vat. *At quem admodum*; Ven. *At quidem admodum*.
[11] Ven. *miserius*.
[12] Ven. *reuelemur*.
[13] Ven. *xvo*; Ital. *a die xvi d'aprile*.
[14] Ven. *diui Henrici faustissimi*.
[15] Vat. omits colophon.
[16] In addition to, or in substitution of, the emendations proposed in my previous article (see *M.L.R.* VII, 12—13).
[17] Vat. omits the title; the only authority for *sanctissimo* is Ven.; the reading of our MS. is confirmed by the Ital. *Al gloriosissimo et felicissimo trionfatore*.
[18] This reading is confirmed by the Ital. *crudelmente*.
[19] This is also the reading of the Vulgate (I *Regum* xv, 18, in A.V. I *Sam.* xv, 18), from which Dante is here quoting *verbatim*.
[20] Vat. omits the colophon.

In the *apparatus criticus* Vat., as before, indicates the Vatican MS.; Tc. = Torricelli (1842)[1]; T. = Torri (1842); F. = Fraticelli (1857); G. = Giuliani (1882); O. = Oxford Dante (1904)[2]; Ital. indicates the Italian text of the early translation attributed to Marsilio Ficino[3].

Univ*er*sis et sing*u*lis ytalie regibus et senator*i*bus alme urbis nec (2) non ducibus marchionibus / Comitibus[4] / atq*ue* pop*u*lis umilis (3) ytalus Dantes Alegherij[5] / florentinus *et* exul / inmer*i*tus orat (4) pacem[6].

[§ 1.] Ecce nu*n*c[7] tem*pu*s / accetabile[8] quo / singna surgu*n*t *con*sola-(5)-tio*n*is *et* pacis / nam dies noua splendescit ab ortu auroram[9] (6) demostra*n*s que iam tenebras / diuturne calamitatis atte-(7)-nuat / Iam que aure orientales / crebescu*n*t / Rutilat celu*m* (8) in labiis suis / *et* Auspitia Gentiu*m* blanda serenitate (9) *con*fortat. Et nos Gaudium expetatu*m* uidebimus q*uod*[10] (10) diu p*er*notauim*us*[11] in deserto / q*uoni*am[12] titan exorietu*r* pacificus (11) *et* iustitia sine sole quasi[13] / eliotropiu*m* hebetata / cum (12) primu*m* Iubar ille uibrau*er*it[14] / reuirescet[15] / sa-(13)-turabunt*ur* om*n*es / qui exuriu*n*t / et sitiu*n*t in lumine radior*um* (14) eius[15] / et *con*fundent*ur* / qui diligu*n*t iniquitate*m* A fatie (15) coruscantis / Arrescit[16] nam*q*ue aures mis*er*icordis[17] / leo fortis / (16) de tribu iuda / atq*ue* ullulatum / univ*er*salis captiuitatis (17) mis*er*ans / moysen

[1] As stated in my previous article (*M.L.R.*, VII, 32), the Latin text of this letter was first printed by F. Torricelli in the *Antologia di Fossombrone* for 22 Oct. 1842. Since that article was printed I have been provided, through the courtesy and generosity of Mr G. W. Harris, Librarian of the Cornell University Library, with a transcript of Torricelli's text from a copy of the *Antologia* (the only one I have been able to hear of) in the Fiske Dante collection in that Library. I am now able to state that the 'unidentified MS.' from which Torricelli printed his text, the *provenance* of which he did not reveal, is none other than the Vatican MS. The same hiatus occur in Torricelli's text as in that MS., and allowing for copyist's errors and for arbitrary emendations, the text is the same throughout. Torricelli's text, therefore, has not the independent authority with which it has hitherto been credited. A complete collation of this text is here given for the first time.

[2] For details as to the editions of Torri, Fraticelli, Giuliani, and the Oxford Dante, see previous article, *loc. cit.*, p. 5.

[3] See previous article, *loc. cit.*, p. 32.

[4] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing words, *ducibus marchionibus comitibus*, were supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*a' duchi, marchesi, conti*), by F. and subsequent editors; T. read *necnon gentibus*; Tc. leaves hiatus.

[5] Vat. *Alagerij*.

[6] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing *-at pacem* was supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*prega pace*), by T. and subsequent editors; Tc. leaves hiatus.

[7] Hiatus in Vat.; the missing words, *ecce nunc*, were supplied conjecturally from Ital. (*ecco ora*), by T. and subsequent editors.

[8] Tc. reads *Ecce nunc tempus, tempus acceptabile*.

[9] Hiatus in Vat., which was filled conjecturally (on the hint of the fragmentary *al* in Vat.) by T.G. *alborem*, Tc. F.O. *albam*.

[10] Vat. *qui*; so Tc. [11] Vat. *pernotitauimus*. [12] Tc. *quum*.

[13] F. *quasi ad*; G.O. *quasi ut*. [14] Vat. *uibrauit*; Tc. *vibrarit*.

[15] Blank in MS. where there has been an erasure.

[16] So also Vat., for *arrexit*. [17] Vat. *misericordes*; Tc. *misericordiae*.

alium suscitauit / qui de Grauam*in*ibus (18) egipitior*um* po*p*ulum suu*m* eripiet Ad t*er*ram / lacte Ac mele[1] (19) manan*tem* / p*er*duc*en*s.

[§ 2.] Lectare[2] ia*m* nu*n*c mise*r*anda ytalia etia*m* (20) sarrace*n*is que[3] statim inuidiosa p*er* orbem uideberis / quia spon-(21)-sus tuus mu*n*di solatiu*m* *et* glor*i*a plebis tue / clemen*t*issimus[4] (22) hericus[5] diuus *et* Aug*ust*us *et* Cesar / Ad nuptias p*ro*perat / esicca (23) lacrimas *et* merror*is* uestigia / dola[6] pulcher*r*ima na*m* p*ro*pe est (24) qui liberabit te de carc*er*e impior*um* / q*ui* p*er*cutie*n*s mallignan*t*es (25) in[7] ore gladij p*er*det eos / *et* uinea*m* suam Aliis locabit agri-(26)-colis / qui fructu*m* iustitie reddan*t* / in t*em*po*r*e messis.

[§ 3.] Set (27) an no*n*[8] mise*r*ebitu*r* cuiq*uam*[9]. i*m*mo ingnoscet / omnibus m*isericord*iam (28) implora*n*tibus / cum sit cesar / *et* maiestas eius de fonte (29) defluat / pietatis / hui*us* iuditiu*m* omnem seue*r*itate*m* abhorret / (30) et semp*er* citra mediu*m* plecte*n*s ultr*a* mediu*m* p*re*-liando[10] se fig*it*. (31) Anne p*ropter*ea neq*uam*[11] hom*in*um applaudet audatias[12] *et* initis[13] / [fol. 142vo] p*re*sum*p*tio*n*um[14] p*ro*cula[15] / p*ro*pinabit. absit q*uoni*am aug*ust*us est / *et* si au-(2)-g*ust*us nonne rellapsor*um* facinora uindicabit[16]? *et* usq*ue* in tessalli*am* (3) in qua finalis dillectio*n*is[17].

[§ 4.] pone sanguis[18] longobardoru*m* choadut-(4)-tam barbarie*m* / et si q*ui*d de troianor*um* latinor*um* q*ue* semine sup*er* est (5) illi cede / ne[19] cu*m* sublimis aq*ui*la fulguris instar descende*n*s (6) affue*r*it / abiectos uideat pullos ei*us* / et p*ro*lis p*ro*pr*ie* locu*m* coruulis (7) occupatu*m*. eia facite scandinauie sobboles ut cui*us* me*r*ito trepi-(8)-datis aduen*t*um / q*uod*[20] ex uobis est p*re*sentiam sitiatis[21]. nec se-(9)-ducat alludens[22] cupiditas more syrenu*m* nescio qua dulcedine (10) uigiliam *ration*is mortifican*s* / p*reo*ccupetis[23] fatie*m* eius in *con*fessio*ne* (11) subiect*ion*is /

[1] Tc. *melle et lacte.* [2] *Sic*; Vat. *letare.* [3] Tc. *quia.*
[4] Tc. *clemens.* [5] *Sic*; Vat. *henricus.* [6] *Sic*; Vat. *dele.*
[7] Blot in MS., but *in* is just legible.
[8] Vat. *Sed non an*; Tc. *Sed an*; T.F.G.O. *Sed an non.*
[9] Tc. *cuique*; T. *Augustus*; Ital. *d' alcuno.*
[10] *Sic*; Vat. *premiando*; so Tc.; Ital. *meritando.*
[11] Tc. T. *nequiorum.* [12] Tc. *audaciis.*
[13] So also Vat.; Tc. *initibus*; T.F.O. *initiis*; G. *rictibus.*
[14] Tc. *praesumptorum.* [15] *Sic*; above is written, *alias pocula.*
[16] Tc. *facinora non judicabit.*
[17] Vat. *usque in tesaliam persequetur. tesalia inquam finalis delectionis*; for *delectionis* (Vat. = *deletionis*) Ital. has *dilezione*; Tc. *usque in Thessaliam persequetur Thessalia igne finalis deletionis.*
[18] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *pone sangu...*; the missing letters of *sanguis* are supplied by T. and subsequent editors; Ital. *O sangue de' Longobardi, pon giuso.*
[19] Hiatus in Vat.; *ne* is supplied by Tc., T. and subsequent editors.
[20] Tc. *quantum.*
[21] Vat. *scitiatis*; T.G. *sentiatis*; Ital. *vogliate* (v.l. *godiate*).
[22] So also Vat.; Tc. T.F.G.O. *illudens*; Ital. *ingannatrice.*
[23] Vat. *preocupatis*; Tc. *praeoccupate.*

et in psalte*rio*[1] penite*n*tie iubiletis[2] / *con*sidera*n*tes quia[3] (12) pote*s*tati resiste*n*s dei ordinatio*n*i resistit / *et qui* diuine ordinatio*n*i rep-(13)-pungnat / uolu*n*tati *omn*ipote*n*tie choequali rechurerat[4] / *et* duru*m* est *contra* (14) stimulu*m* calcistrare[5].

[§ 5.] Vos aute*m qui* lugetis oppresi[6] / ani*m*um sulleua-(15)-te q*uoniam*[7] prope est ue*s*tra salus / assu*mm*ere[8] rastru*m* bone umilitatis (16) atq*ue* glebis exuste a*nim*ositatis occatis / agellum sternite me*n*tis (17) ue*s*tre / ne forte celestis imber semente*m* ue*s*tram a*n*te iactu*m*. preue-(18)-nie*n*s in uacuu*m* de altissimo cadat / non[9] resiliat[10] gratia dei ex uobis (19) ros[11] cotidianus ex lapide *set* uelud fecunda uallis / concipite ac ui-(20)-ride germinetis uiride dico fructiferu*m*[12] uere pacis / qua q*uide*m (21) uiriditate ue*s*tra terra ue*r*na*n*te / nouus agricola romanoru*m* co*n*silij / (22) sui boues ad aratru*m* affectuosius *et* co*n*fide*n*tius co*n*iugabit. p*ar*ci-(23)-te p*ar*cite ia*m* ex nu*n*c olrimi[13] q*ui* mecu*m* iniuria*m* passi[14] estis / ut (24) hectoreus pastor uos oues de ouili suo cognoscat cui et-(25)-si a*nim*auertio[15] te*m*poralis diuinitus est indulta tame*n* ut eius boni-(26)-tate[16] redoleat a quo uelud a punto bifurcatur petri cesarisq*ue* (27) potestas uoluptuose familia*m*[17] suam corrigit / set ei uoluptuosius (28) miseretur[18].

[§ 6.] itaq*ue* si culpa uetus non obest / que plerumq*ue* suppi-(29)-natur ut coluber *et* uertitur[19] in se ipsam. huic[20] utriq*ue* potestis ad-(30)-uertere pace*m* unicuiq*ue* preparari. *et*[21] insperare[22] letitie ia*m* priuitias[23]

[1] Vat. *et psalterio*; so Tc.; Ital. *e nel saltero.* [2] Tc. *jubilate.*
[3] Tc. *quod.* [4] *Sic*; Vat. *recalcitrat*; so Tc.; Ital. *recalcitra.*
[5] *Sic*; Vat. *calcitrare*; Ital. *calcitrare.* [6] *Sic*; Vat. *oppressi.*
[7] Tc. *quia.* [8] Vat. *asumite*; so Tc.; Ital. *pigliate.*
[9] Tc. *non enim.* [10] Vat. *resiliet*; so Tc.; T.F.G.O. *resiliat*; Ital. *torni indietro.*
[11] Vat. *tanquam ros*; so Tc.; Ital. *siccome....* [12] Tc. *fructiferorum.*
[13] So apparently MS.; Vat. *o carissimi*; so Tc.; Ital. *o carissimi.* [14] Tc. *pasti.*
[15] *Sic*; above is written what appears to be, *alias animauersio*; Vat. *animaduersio*; so Tc.; Ital. *provvisione* (v.l. *divisione*).
[16] Vat. *bonitatem*; so Tc. [17] Tc. *familiae.*
[18] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *uoluptuose famili miseretur*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*desiderosamente la sua famiglia corregge, ma più volenterosamente misericordia tribuisce*), by T. *voluptuosae familiae libentius m.*; F.O. *voluptuose familiam suam corrigit, libentius vero ejus m.*; G. *voluptuose familiae suae m.*; Tc. leaves hiatus.
[19] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *plerumque suppi et uertitur*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*spesse volte come serpente si storce ed in se medesima si travolge*) by T. and subsequent editors, *plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur*; Tc. *plerumque supervenit et vertitur.*
[20] Tc. *hinc.*
[21] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *unicuique et*; the missing words are supplied conjecturally, from Ital. (*a ciascuno essere apparecchiato*), by F. and subsequent editors, *u. esse paratam et*; T. *unicuique gratissimam et*; Tc. *uniuscujusque, et.*
[22] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *erate*; T. reads *oratae*; F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*di sperata*, v.l. *di desperata*), *speratae*; Tc. *speratae*; the reading of our MS. is an obvious error for *insperate.*
[23] *Sic*; an alternative reading is written above, but is illegible; Vat. *primitias*; so Tc.; Ital. *primizie.*

(31) degustare. Euigilare[1] igit*ur* om*n*es *et* assurgite regi ue*st*ro i*n*cole latiales[2] [fol. 143ro] non solu*m* sibi ad imp*er*ium set ut liberi / ad rengnu*m*[3] rese*r*uati.

[§ 7.] nec t*amen*[4] (2) ut assurgatis exortor / set ut illius obstupescatis aspetu*m* qui (3) bibitis fluenta eius ei*usque* ma*r*ia nauigatis / qui calcatis arenas (4) littor*um et* alpium su*m*mitates / sue q*ue* sunt[5] / qui pu*bl*icis qu*i*buscu*mque* gau-(5)-detis *et* res p*r*iuatas ui*n*c*u*lo sue legis no*n* alit*er* p*r*esidetis[6]. Nollite (6) uelud ingnari decipe*re* uos met ipsos / tanq*uam* sopni*a*ntes[7] *in* cordibus (7) et dice*n*tes[8] do*m*i*n*um no*n* h*ab*emus / ortus enim eius et lacus est (8) q*uod* celum circuit. Num[9] dei est mare *et* ipse fecit illud *et* arrida*m* (9) fundauerun*t* manus eius / num[10] deum principe*m*[11] p*r*edestinasse re-(10)-lucet i*n* miris effectibus. Et[12] uerbo uerbi *con*firmasse p*r*ofitetu*r*[13] (11) ecc*l*esi*a*.

[§ 8.] nempe si a creatura mu*n*di inuisibilia dei p*er* ea que f*ac*ta (12) su*n*t rellitta[14] *con*spitiu*n*tur / et si ex nutioribu*s*[15] nobis innotiora simp*l*ic-(13)-*iter*[16] iter est[17] humane app*r*eh*e*nsioni / ut[18] p*er* motu*m* celi motore*m* intelligimus[19] (14) *et* eius uelle / facile p*r*edestinatio hec *etiam*[20] leuit*er* innotescat[21]. Nam (15) si a prima sintillula hui*us* ingnis[22] reuoluamus p*r*eteri*t*a ex quo (16) s*c*ilicet argis[23] hospitalitas / est a frigibus denegata[24] / *et* usq*ue* ad optauiani[25] (17) triumphos mu*n*di gesta reuisere uacet[26] / no*n* nulla[27] eor*um* uidebimus (18) humane uirtutis o*mnin*o culmina trascendisse[28] / *et* deum p*er* ho*m*ines tanq*uam* (19)

[1] *Sic*; Vat. *Euigilate.*
[2] Hiatus in Vat., which omits *incole latiales*; the missing words are supplied, conjecturally from Ital. (*o abitatori d' Italia*), by T. and subsequent editors, *incolae Italiae*; Tc. leaves hiatus.
[3] Vat. *regimen*; so Tc.; Ital. *reggimento.*
[4] Vat. *tantum*; Ital. *solamente.*
[5] Tc. *quae sunt suae.*
[6] *Sic*; above is written, *alias possidetis*; Vat. *possidetis*; so Tc.; Ital. *possedete.*
[7] *Sic*; Vat. *somniantes*; so Tc.
[8] Tc. *in cordibus vestris dicentes.*
[9] Vat. *nam*; so Tc.; Ital. *Or non è...?*
[10] Vat. *unde*; so Tc.; Ital. *Non riluce...?*
[11] Vat. *romanum principem*; so Tc.; Ital. *il romano principe.*
[12] Tc. *verum.*
[13] Vat. *propreerius profitetur*; Tc.T.F.G.O. *posterius p.*; Ital. *confessa...essere poscia* (v.l. *posto e*) *confermato.*
[14] *Sic*; Vat. *intellecta*; so Tc.
[15] *Sic*; above is written, *alias notioribus*; Vat. *notioribus*; so Tc.
[16] So also Vat.; Tc.T.F.G.O. *similiter.*
[17] *Sic*; Vat. *interest*; so Tc.; Ital. *egli s' appartiene.*
[18] Vat. *ne*; Tc. *ut*; Ital. *sicchè.*
[19] Vat. *intelligamus*; so Tc.; Ital. *conosciamo.*
[20] Tc. *vel.*
[21] Vat. *intuentibus innotescat*; Tc.T.F.G.O. *i. innotescet*; Ital. *agli adguardatori* (v.l. *auguratori*) *sieno* (v.l. *fieno*) *chiari.*
[22] Vat. *a prima huius ignis*; T. *a prima hujus origine*; F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*dalla prima favilla di questo fuoco*), *a prima hujus ignis favilla*; Tc. *a prima favilla hujus ignis.*
[23] Tc. *scilicet et Argis.*
[24] Vat. *deregata*; T. *derogata*; Tc.F.O. *denegata*; Ital. *negata.*
[25] *Sic*; Vat. *octauianj*; so Tc.
[26] Tc. *vacat.*
[27] Vat. omits *non*; Ital. *molte cose.*
[28] *Sic*; so Tc.; Vat. *transcendisse.*

celos[1] nouos / aliquid operatum fuisse / non et enim[2] / semper nos agimus / (20) quin[3] interdum uteusilia[4] dei sumus / ac[5] uoluntates humane quibus (21) inest ex natura liberata[6] / etiam[7] inferioris affectus immunes quandoque aguntur / (22) et obnoxie uoluntati eterne / sepe illi ancillantur ingnare /

[§ 9.] et si hec (23) que uti[8] principia sunt adprobandum[9] quod queritur non suffitiunt quis non ab (24) illata conclusione[10] per talia precedentia mecum[11] oppinari cogetur. Pace[12] uide-(25)-licet annorum[13] orbem totaliter amplecxata. que[14] sui sillogizantis fa-(26)-tiem[15] dei filium[16] sicuti opere patrato ostendit[17]. Et hic cum ad reuel-(27)-lationem spiritus homo factus euangelizaret in terris quasi diruens[18] duo rengna / (28) sibi et cesari uniuersa distribuens / alterutri iussit[19] reddi que sua (29) sunt.

[§ 10.] quod[20] si pertimax[21] animus[22] poscit ulterius non dum annuens ueritati (30) uerba christi examinet. etiam[23] iam ligati / cui cum potestatem suam pillatus obiceret (31) lux nostra de sursum esse asseruit quod ille iactabat ' qui cesaris ibi auctoritate [fol. 143vo] uicarie[24] gerebat offitium. Non igitur ambuletis sicut et gentes (2) ambulant in uanitate sensus tenebris obscurati / set apperite (3) oculos mentis uestre ac uidete quoniam regem nobis celi et terre dominus ordi-(4)-nauit. Hic est quem petrus dei uicarius honorificare nos mo-(5)-net / quem clemens nunc petri subcessor luce apostolice benedictionis (6) inluminat ut ubi radius spiritualis non sufficit / ibi splen-(7)-dor minoris luminaris[25] inlustret.

[1] Vat. *per celos*; so Tc.
[2] Vat. *non eterni*; Tc. *non etenim*; Ital. *in verità non sempre mai.*
[3] Tc. *quoniam.*
[4] *Sic*; Vat. *utensilia*; so Tc.; Ital. *fatture.*
[5] Tc. *et.*
[6] Vat. *libertas*; so Tc.; Ital. *la libertade.*
[7] Tc. *ut.*
[8] Vat. *ubi*; Tc. *uti*; Ital. *siccome.*
[9] Vat. *ad probandum*; so Tc.; Ital. *a provare.*
[10] Tc. *ad illatam conclusionem.*
[11] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *precedentia cum*; Tc. leaves hiatus, but punctuates *praecedentia..., cum*; and conjectures 'forsan: accedet,' the blank is filled conjecturally by T. *ita mecum*; F.G.O. *nobiscum.*
[12] Tc. *in pace.*
[13] Vat. *annorum duodecim*; so Tc.; Ital. *dodici anni.*
[14] Tc. *qua.*
[15] Hiatus in Vat., which reads *silogiza fatiem*; Tc.T.F.G.O. conjecturally, from Ital. (*del suo sillogizzatore*), *syllogizatoris f.*
[16] Tc. *filius.*
[17] Vat. *ostenditur*; so Tc.; Ital. *dimostra.*
[18] *Sic*; Vat. *dirimens*; so Tc.; Ital. *dividendo.*
[19] Vat. *duxit*; Tc.T.G.O. *dixit*; Ital. *commandò.*
[20] Tc. *Quare.*
[21] *Sic*; above is written *alias pertinax.*
[22] Tc. *aliquis*; Ital. *animo.*
[23] Tc. *tum.*
[24] Vat. *a. vicaria*; so Tc.; Ital. *per vicaria autorità.*
[25] Tc. *luminis*; Ital. *lume.*

Proposed emendations[1] *in the Oxford text of Epist.* V.

l. 3. *For* albam, *read* (*with MS.*) ab ortu Auroram[2].

l. 11. *For* quasi ut heliotropium, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) quasi heliotropium[3].

l. 44. *For* initiis, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) initis[4].

l. 59. *For* illudens, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) alludens[5].

l. 63. *For* psalterio, *read* (*with MS.*) in psalterio[6].

l. 76. *For* neve resiliat, *read* (*with MS.*) non resiliat[7].

ll. 92—3. *For* libentius vero ejus miseretur, *read* (*with MS.*) sed ei voluptuosius miseretur[8].

l. 95. *For* plerumque serpentis modo torquetur et vertitur, *read* (*with MS.*) plerumque supinatur ut coluber et vertitur[8].

ll. 97—8. *For* unicuique esse paratam et speratae laetitiae, *read* (*with MS.*) unicuique praeparari et insperatae[9] laetitiae[8].

l. 100. *For* incolae Italiae, *read* (*with MS.*) incolae Latiales[8].

[1] In addition to, or in substitution of, the emendations proposed in my previous article (see *M.L.R.* VII, 38—9).

[2] This reading is confirmed by the Italian *da Oriente l' Aurora*.

[3] The sense would be the same, but there is no authority for the interpolated *ut*. There is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of *heliotropium* here. Some read 'quasi ad heliotropium,' and take it to refer to the winter solstice; but there is no authority for this reading, and none that I can discover for this interpretation. The Italian translator gives no help; his rendering, 'al termine della retrogradazione,' seems also to point to an astronomical interpretation. but it is difficult to see what connection the retrogression of the planets can have with the context. Others think the reference is to the plant, otherwise known as *solsequium*, 'turnsole'; but the expression *hebetata*, 'dulled,' 'dimmed,' hardly seems appropriate as applied to a plant. I think Dante must have had in mind the gem *heliotropium* or *heliotropia*, whose properties when exposed to the sun in certain conditions are described in the old lapidaries, and in the medieval dictionaries of Papias, Uguccione da Pisa, and Giovanni da Genova. In the absence of the sun ('sine sole') the stone would naturally lose its peculiar properties, and would appropriately be described as *hebetata*, a term applied by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* XXXVII, 5, 18) to a species of emerald, which was said to be deprived of its brilliancy by exposure to the sun ('in sole hebetari'). It will be remembered that Dante refers in the *Commedia* to another reputed property of the gem heliotrope, that of rendering its wearer invisible (*Inf.* XXIV, 93: 'Senza sperar pertugio o eliotropia').

[4] I had previously proposed to read *initibus* with Torricelli, supposing his reading to have MS. authority; but as this proves not to be the case, and as both MSS. agree, *initis* (from neut. plur. *inita* used as substantive) is to be preferred. This reading receives indirect support from the Italian translation, in which the wholly irrelevant words 'dolce e piano' occur. I was puzzled to account for the insertion of this phrase, until it occurred to me that it is no doubt the translator's rendering of *mitis*, either his own, or a copyist's, misreading of the *initis* of the Latin original.

[5] Giovanni da Genova in the *Catholicon* says, 'est *alludere illudere*.'

[6] This is supported by *Psalm* XCIV, 2 in the Vulgate (of which Dante's words are a reminiscence): 'Praeoccupemus faciem ejus in confessione: et in psalmis jubilemus ei'; and by the Italian *nel saltero*.

[7] I had previously proposed to read (with Vat. and Torricelli) *non resiliet*; but the subjunctive *resiliat*, as read by our MS., and supported by the Ital. (*nè torni indietro*), seems preferable.

[8] In confirmation of Barbi; see previous article, *loc. cit.* p. 35 n. 16, p. 36 nn. 1, 4, 5, 6.

[9] MS. *insperare*, for *insperate*.

l. 123. *For* similiter, *read* (*with MS. and Vat.*) simpliciter.

ll. 127—8. *For* a prima huius ignis favilla, *read* (*with MS.*) a prima scintillula huius ignis.

l. 129. *For* Argis hospitalitas...denegata, *read* Argis hospitalitas... derogata[1].

[1] In spite of the evidence of our MS. in favour of *denegata*, I still prefer *derogata*, on the grounds stated in my previous article (*loc. cit.* p. 38 n. 11). As to the required sense of *derogare*, Papias gives as synonyms (under *detractare*), *derogare*, *dedignari*, *temnere*, and (under *derogare*), *detrahere* (which is a synonym of *laedere*). For Dante's use of the word in a somewhat similar sense, cf. *Mon.* III, 3, l. 58; and *Epist.* IX, l. 43. In the note on this passage in my previous article I referred to Wicksteed's suggestion as to the allusion being to the repulse of the Argonauts from the Simoïs by Laomedon, and the subsequent reprisals of the Greeks; and, accepting his translation of *Argis* ('to the Argives'), I spoke of 'the denial of hospitality *to the Greeks* by the Trojans.' But *Argi*, of course, properly means not 'Argives' but 'Argos,' as Dante must have known from its frequent occurrence in the *Aeneid* (cf. I, 24, 285; II, 178; VII, 286; X, 779, 782) and *Thebaid*, and from the commentary of Servius on *Aeneid* I, 24, where it is stated: '*Argos* in numero singulari generis neutri est, ut Horatius: *Aptum dicet equis Argos ditesque Mycenas*. In plurali vero masculini, *hi Argi*. Caeterum derivatio nominis *Argivos* facit, non *Argos*.' He might also have known this from the *Catholicon*, where Giovanni da Genova says: '*Argi*, masculini generis in plurali, nomen loci.' But if *Argi* be taken here in its classical sense of 'Argos,' and if the allusion be, as I suppose, to the great 'historical' landmark, the rape of Helen, we are confronted by the difficulty that Helen, as Dante must have been well aware, was abducted not from Argos, but from Sparta. For my supposition to be tenable, it must be assumed therefore, either that Dante here uses Argos, not to indicate the town of Argos, but, in the wider sense, of Greece, as in *Aeneid* II. 95, in which case *Argis* would be a locative, 'in Greece'; or that he held that *Argi* might also be used as the equivalent of *Argivi*, the descendants of Argus (just as he uses *Turni* in *Epist.* VII, l. 98 for the Rutulians, the followers of Turnus). There is evidence to show that *Argi* was interpreted as *Argivi* in late and medieval Latin. The compilers of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (in course of publication at Leipzig) quote from the commentary of the pseudo-Fulgentius on the *Thebaid* the following: 'Argeos grece, providentia latine, unde Greci dicuntur Argi, id est providi.' To which I may add the much more important testimony of Papias in his *Elementarium Doctrinae Rudimentum* (c. 1060): '*Argi* graece et *argiui* dicti ab argo rege filio apis. Iidem *danai* a danao rege. Iidem quoque *argolici* ab argo'; and of Uguccione da Pisa in his *Magnae Derivationes* (c. 1200): '*Argos* nomen civitatis in Grecia, neutri generis et indeclinabile in singulari, sed in plurali masculini generis, et declinatur *Argi-orum*, unde dicti sunt *Argi*, vel ab *Argo* rege dicuntur.' This interpretation of *Argi* as *Argivi* would be due no doubt to the misunderstanding of such a statement as that of St Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei* (a work familiar to Dante): 'Apis rex Argivorum mortuus est in Aegypto. Huic filius Argus successit in regnum, ex cuius nomine et Argi et ex hoc Argivi appellati sunt' (XVIII, 6)—a passage which is actually quoted in the German *Thesaurus* as evidence of the use of *Argi* in the sense of *Argivi**. It may further be noted (on the authority of the *Thesaurus*) that in the passage from the commentary of Servius quoted above there is an alternative reading 'Argivus facit *et* Argus.' It is quite conceivable, therefore, that Dante may have *bona fide* used *Argi* in the sense of *Argivi*, while aware of the fact that in Virgil and Statius it stood for Argos. If *denegata* be read, and the allusion to the comparatively obscure episode of the repulse of the Greeks by Laomedon (mentioned by Dares Phrygius, *De Excidio Trojae*, cap. ii, and repeated by Brunetto Latini in his *Trésor*, I, 32) be accepted, then 'Argis' *must* be taken as equivalent to 'Argivis,' as by the author of the early Italian translation ('a' Greci') and by all subsequent translators, Italian, English, and German.

* That St Augustine uses *Argi* in the sense of 'Argos' here ('from *Argus* the city got its name *Argi*, and from *Argi* the *Argivi* were so called') is evident from a passage in the very next chapter: 'Argis adhuc manente Argo, mortuus est Joseph in Aegypto' (XVIII, 7). When he speaks of the people, he calls them *Argivi*: 'Hoc (*sc.* Argo) regnante apud Argivos...mortuus est Jacob in Aegypto' (XVIII, 6; cf. XVIII, 3, 4, 5, 8, etc.).

l. 145. *For* nobiscum, *read* (*with MS.*) mecum.

l. 148. *For* syllogizatoris, *read* (*with MS.*) syllogizantis[1].

In a subsequent number of the *Review* I hope to print a third article, giving a transcript of the Venetian text (*Cod. Marc. Lat.* XIV, 115) of Dante's letter to the Emperor Henry VII (*Epist.* VII), thus completing the series of transcripts of the three known MSS. of the Latin text of this letter.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

*** *Addenda to previous article.*—In *Epist.* II, § 1, l. 8, where the Vatican MS. (the only MS. in which this letter has been preserved) reads 'dignis premiis *me netatur*,' all the editors have adopted the emendation *muneratur* made (*sub silentio*) by Torri. Some such word is obviously required by the sense. Dr Heberden has suggested to me that the more likely word is *remuneratur*. He points out that Dante nowhere uses the word *munerare*, but twice uses *remunerare*; e.g. in *Epist.* I, § 2, l. 43, where it is associated, as is the verb in the present passage, with *praemia digna*: 'si qua coelo est pietas quae talia remuneranda prospiciat, illa vobis praemia digna ferat'; and in *Mon.* II, 8, l. 94. Further, Dante uses *remuneratio* in *Epist.* X, § 30, l. 590. The longer word has also in its favour the fact that it would account for the gap in the MS. reading, which no doubt in the copy from which the Vatican MS. was transcribed had been obscured by a blot or erasure.

To the list of proposed emendations in the Oxford text of this letter printed in the previous article (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, VII, 26) should therefore be added:

l. 8. *For* muneratur, *read* remuneratur.

* * * *

The following emendation (omitted by an oversight in the previous article[2]) in the text of *Epist.* VI, should also be added:

l. 142. *For* quantum, *read* (*with MS.*) quam.

And the following addition should be made to the note[3] on *Epist.* I, l. 24:—'The verb *pollucere* is used by Dante himself elsewhere, viz. in

[1] I had previously proposed to read *qua sui syllogizatoris facies, Dei filius...ostenditur* (see previous article, *loc. cit.* p. 39, n. 1), the reading of Torricelli, but the *ostendit* of our MS. (supported by the Ital. *dimostra*) renders my suggested emendation of the Oxford text superfluous.

[2] *M.L.R.* VII, 19.

[3] *M.L.R.* VII, 31 n. 3.

the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, II, 1, l. 13: "ordine pertractantes illo quem in fine primi libri polluximus"—where for *polluximus*, which he apparently did not understand, Giuliani *sub silentio* substituted *polliciti sumus*, just as here the editors have substituted *pollicetur* for *polluxit*.'

* * * *

Since the above article was written my attention has been directed to the edition of Dante's letters issued recently at Florence by G. C. Sansoni, under the editorship of G. L. Passerini (*Le Opere Minori di Dante Alighieri, novamente annotate da* G. L. Passerini.—VI. *Le Epistole e la Disputa interno all'Acqua e alla Terra*. Firenze, MCMX.). Passerini's text is that of the Oxford Dante, 'con qualche miglioramento.' The divergences from the Oxford text, in the letters which have been dealt with in these two articles, are about a dozen in number, exclusive of misprints, of which there are several somewhat serious ones[1]. Whether all the alterations are 'miglioramenti' is a matter of opinion. Passerini adopts (without acknowledgment) Novati's proposed emendations (recorded in my previous article) in *Epist.* I (l. 27, *ruebant* for *rubebant*), and *Epist.* VI (l. 143, *retes* for *pedes*). In *Epist.* III, l. 2, he reads *quam affectus gratuitas dominantis*, where O. reads *quem a. gratitudinis dominantur* (MS. *quam a. gratuitatis dominantis*); in l. 5, he reads (with MS.) *negligentem*, where O. reads *negligenter*; in l. 7, he reads (with MS.) *oraculi*, where O. reads *oratiunculae*; in l. 19, he reads (with MS.) *diurnis*, where O. reads *divinis*; he ignores, in l. 16, the correction *forma* for *fortunae*, to which Novati drew attention (see *Dante e la Lunigiana*, pp. 530—1). In *Epist.* V, l. 50, he reads *Langobardorum* for *Longobardorum* (the reading of both MSS.); in l. 76, he reads *ne resiliat*, where O. reads *neve resiliat* (Vat. *non resiliet*; Pant. *non resiliat*); in ll. 92—3, and 97, he adopts (without acknowledgment) the readings of the S. Pantaleo MS. recorded by Barbi (in *Bull. Soc. Dant.* N.S. II, 23 n.); while he ignores Barbi's corrections, from the same MS., of the

[1] For instance, p. 34, l. 71, *mentes* for *mentis*; p. 38, l. 125, *resolvamus* for *revolvamus*; p. 70, l. 93, *est* is omitted; p. 72, l. 111, *quoad* for *quod*; p. 72, l. 112, *ut* is omitted. There are other misprints in the text of the letters, of less consequence, on p. 50, l. 69; p. 60, ll. 193—4; p. 62, l. 7; p. 68, l. 77; p. 72, l. 122; p. 74, ll. 135, 149, 153. We feel bound to protest against the editor's disregard of his responsibilities in this and other respects. The volume abounds with careless misprints. There are no less than eleven in the text of the three short Battifolle letters, one of them (*familiater* for *familiariter*) being actually reproduced from Torri's text. Further, the editor is culpably reckless in some of his statements. For example, he asserts (p. 192) that *Epist.* X (to Can Grande) is one of the three letters mentioned by Villani, which, as the editor of the *Giornale Dantesco* ought to know, is not the fact. Again, we are told (p. 195) that the last *four* letters in the volume were addressed to Margaret of Brabant, among these four being the apocryphal letter in Italian to Guido da Polenta! Also, it is stated (p. 186) that the text of *Epist.* VIII was first printed by Witte in 1826, whereas Witte's edition of Dante's letters did not appear until the following year.

conjectural readings in ll. 95, 97—8. In *Epist.* VII, ll. 111—12, he omits (presumably as a gloss, on the authority of Witte) the words *quae quidem et Amalech et Agag sonare dicuntur*, which are in all three MSS., and which are an essential part of the text, as has already been shown (see *M. L. R.* VII, 9, n. 16). In *Epist.* VI, l. 169, he ignores the correction *punita* for *Punica* (see *Bull. Soc. Dant.* N. S. XIII, 267 n.); and in the title of *Epist.* I he ignores Del Lungo's correction *Marchia Tervisina* for *Maritima, terris* (see *Dino Compagni e la sua Cronica*, II, 587 n.).

T.

LYDGATE'S VERSES ON QUEEN MARGARET'S ENTRY INTO LONDON.

ALTHOUGH John Stow recorded the fact that Lydgate made verses for the pageants at Queen Margaret's Entry into London in 1445, no copy of them has been known to students of Lydgate. Even Dr MacCracken, who has expended so much research in collecting the poems of the Monk of Bury, has recently declared that these verses have not survived[1]. It is a pleasant surprise, therefore, to find the 'lost' poem in MS. Harl. 3869, immediately preceding the *Confessio Amantis*, which occupies the remainder of the manuscript. Though written in a different hand from the *Confessio*, the Lydgate poem does not appear to be a later addition. Indeed, the fact that it stands upon leaves which make up part of the first gathering (which includes also the beginning of Gower's poem) makes it impossible to suppose that it was at any time a separate leaflet.

Though one finds no ascription of these verses to Lydgate in the MS., the evidence of style is, I think, conclusive. Moreover they correspond closely to the account of Lydgate's verses given by Stow. At the top of the page (fol. 2[a]) on which the verses begin a late sixteenth century hand has noted the occasion for which they were designed. A portion of this superscription has been trimmed away by the binder. What remains reads as follows:

> 1445. ye 28 of may Quene margaret.....
> the Citie of london.

I give herewith the text of the verses, together with the extremely interesting headings, marking the places at which they were to be spoken:

[1] *Minor Poems of John Lydgate*, Part I, EETS. 1911, p. xl.

(fol. 2ᵃ) **Atte the Brigge foot in Suthwerke | Pees and plente.**
Ingredimini et replete terram.

|| Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | by influence of grace
Doughter of Iher*uſalem*[1] | oure pleſaunce
And ioie | Welcome as euere p*r*inceſſe was
With hert entier | and hool affiaunce
Cauſer of Welth | ioie and abundaunce
Youre Cite youre poeple | youre ſubgites alle
with herte with worde with dede.[2]
Welcome | welcome | welcome vn to you calle

|| At Noes Shippe vpon the brigge.
|| Iam non vltra irafcar ſuper terram.

|| So truſteth youre Poeple | with affiaunce
Through youre grace | and highe benignite
Twixt the Reawmes two | Englande and ffraunce
Pees ſhal approche | Reſt and vnite
Mars ſette a side | with alle hys cruelte
Whiche to longe | hath troubled the Reawmes tweyne
Bydynge youre Coumfort | in this aduerſite
Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne

|| Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne
Right as whilom | by goddes myght and grace
Noe this Arke | didde forge and ordeyne
Where in he and hys | myght eſcape and paſſe
The flood of vengeaunce | cauſed by treſpaſſe
Conueied aboute | as god lifte hym to gye
By moiean of mercy | founde a reſtyng place
After the flood | vppon this armonie.

|| Vn to the Doue | that brought the braunche of pees
Reſemblynge youre ſympleneſſe columbyne
power colu*m*byne
Tokyn and ſigne | the floode ſhulde ceſſe.
Conducte by grace | and pure diuine

[1] An allusion to the fact that Margaret's father was 'King of Jerusalem.' So Wm. of Worcester refers to her as 'filiam Regis Neapolis, Ceciliae et Jerusalem' (*Annales Rer. Anglic.*, Ed. Hearne, II, 462).
[2] Interlined by the same hand.

Sonne of Comfort | gynneth faire to ſhyne
By youre preſence | wherto we synge and seyne
Welcome of ioie | right extendet lyne
Mooſt criſten Princeſſe | oure lady ſouereyne

|| Now at Draught Brigge.

(fol. 2^{b}) [At bottom of fol. 2^{a} and top of fol. 2^{b} sixteen lines' space has been left blank.]

|| At leden halle. || Madame grace Chauncelere de dieu.

||| Oure benigne princeſſe | and lady ſouereyne
Grace conueie you forthe | and be youre gide
In good life longe | proſperouſly to Reyne
Trouth and mercy | to gedre ben allied
Juſtice and Pees | theſe Suſtres ſchal prouide
Twixt Reawmes tweyn̄. ſtedfaſt loue to ſette
God and grace | the pa*r*ties han applied (?)
Now the Suſtres | haue hem kiſte and mette

|| Prenoſtike of pees | ferme and infenite
Dame grace | goddes vicarie generalle
ffoure patentes | faire | freſſh and legible
Conteynyng .iiij. preceptes | imp*e*rialle
Sealles impreſſed for memorialle
To these Suſtres foure | thus be directe
Whiche as Mynyſtres | further p*ro*clamen ſhalle
Tencreſen pees | werres to correcte.

|| Clergie knyghthode | the lawes co*m*mendable
Affentyng alle this matere | to ratefie
Conſeile of grace | haldyng ferme and ſtable
George and Dioniſe | for here poeple crie
Vppon the lorde | that alle ſchall iuſtefie
This tyme of grace | thus wolde the ſtorie ſeyne
Trustynge that pees | ſchall floure and fructifie
By you Prynceſſe | and lady ſouereyne

|| At the Tonne in Cornehille.

|| Aungeles of pees | ſhall haue dominacioun
Sentence yeuen | from the heuenes highe
(fol. 3ª) Siewed by grace | and good mediacioun
Pees graunted | to growe and multeplie
Exiled thangeles of wrecched tirannye
Werre proſcribed | pees ſhal haue hys place
Bleſſide be Margarete | makyng this purchace

|| Conueie of grace. Virgyne mooſt benigne.
Oo bleſſid martir | holy margarete
Maugre the myght | of ſpirites maligne
To god aboue | hire praier pure and ſwete
Maketh now for Reſt | pees and quiete
Shewed here pleynly | in this ſtorie
Oure queene Margarete | to ſignifie

|| God in heuene | comaundynge abſtinence
Noo wicked Aungel | ſchall do more greuaunce
Erthe See | and Trees ſhall ben in exiſtence
Obeiſaunt to mannes wille | and pleſaunce
Deſired pees | bitwixt Englande and ffraunce
This tyme of grace | by mene of Magarete
We triſte to god | to lyuen in quiete

|| At the grete Conduite in chepe.

|| Grace in this lyf | and aftirwarde glorie
Dauid in the pſalme | he ſaith thus expreſſe
How pleſaunt be | thy tabernacles highe
lorde he ſaith | this pſalme by ſhort proceſſe
Of oure lorde concludeth | high goodneſſe
Nooman to lacke reward | when he goth hens
That lyueth here | in parfite innocens

|| Enſaumpled pleynly | by faire parable
Ten virgynes | ayens the ſpouſe they yede
ffyue necligent refuſed | founde vnable
And of the Spouſe | fyue prudent had mede
ffor contynence in thoght | worde and dede
Noo mannes laude | ſechynge in thaire entent
To serue the ſpouſe | hire hertes onely brent

|| The Spouſe is ſought | ſponſus with hire is mette
After laboure | he wille ſhe take hire reſt
(fol. 3ᵇ) So moche he hathe | hys herte vppon hire ſette
Now hath the Turtle | founde a pleſaunt Neſt
Cōme on ſhe ſaith | I wil yeue the my breſt
Who ſeketh Reſt | with feithfull trewe corage
Shalle dwelle atte laſt | in goddes heritage.

|| Sponſus pees | the Kynge will make hys ffeſte
Alle thyng is redy | plentie and suffiſaunce
Praied for to come | geſtes mooſt and leſte
Vn to the Spouſes | full of heuenly purueaunce
Milke and honye | flowyng in habundaunce
Aboute the londe | whither he hath vs brought
Right ferre and wide | geſtes clept and ſought

|| Eteth and dryncketh | my ffrendes of the beſte
Mooſt chered frendes | dryncketh inwardly
After the ffeſte | take ye youre Reſte
Thus ſeithe the Spouſe | hys ffeſte to magnifie
This ioious Canticle | dothe ſignifie
A pees ſhall be | where as now trouble is
After this lyfe | endely in blys.

|| At the Croſſe in Chepe

| Sacris ſolempnijs iuncta ſunt gaudia. &c.

|| Oo blifful pſalme and ſong celeſtialle
Letatus ſum | for thynges that I here
Noon erthely ioie | compared nor egalle
May bēn here to this blys | may not diſpeire
But ſchyneth amydde | the heuenly ſpere
Thorient Sonne | that noon Eclipſe may fade
To goddes houſe | now ſchall we goo right glade

|| Many manſioun bilt in that paleis
Of that Cite | thynges Right gloriouſe
Been ſaide | o lorde who can thy paleis preiſe
So is it faire | and inly ſpeciouſe
All holyneſſe beſemeth | the lordes houſe
Sanctus is ſonge | in euery Ierarchie
Praiſyng the lorde | of eternall glorie

(fol. 4[a]) || Oo declared Prynceffe | vn to youre noble grace
How god hath made | this conducte and conueye
Thus throgh youre Cite | from place to place
More hertly welcom̃ | then youre folk can feie
Enioieng entierly | youre highe nobleye
This pagent wold mene | youre excellence
That ther is ioie | in verrey exiſtence.

|| Where is reioiced | alle felicite
Withouten ende | eternally tendure
Contemplacioun | of the Deitę
Which noon erthely langage | may diſcure
God behalden | of hys creature
Whiche aperteneth | to goſtly ſuffiſaunce
Whan from the worlde | is made diffeueraunce.

|| ffrom vertu to vertu | men ſhall vp aſcende
Than ſhall god be ſeyn̄ | in the mount ſion̄
Thus you gide | vn to youre lyues ende
We praie the lorde | that gideth al[1] allon̄
So that with yow | we may atteigne ecchon̄
To the faire Cite | of Iheruſalem.
Biſette aboute | with many a precious gemme

|| At Seynt Michaeles in Querne.

|| Aſſumpt aboue | the heuenly Ierarchie
Criſtes Modre | Virgyn̄ immaculate
God hys Tabernacle | to ſanctifie
Of Sterres .xij. the Croune hath prepareate
Empriſe queene and ladie laureate
Praie for oure queene | that criſt[1] will here gouerne
Longe here on lyue | in hire noble aſtate
Aftirward Crowne here | in bliſſe eterne

|| This ſtorie to youre highnes | wolde expreſſe
The grete Refurecioun generall
Where of[1] oure feith | bereth pleyn̄ witneſſe
The ferefull ſowne | of Trumpe Iudiciall

[1] This word has been interlined by a different hand of about the same date.

(fol. 4ᵇ) Vppon the poeple | ẏ[t][1] fodeynly fhall calle.
Eche man to make a compte | and rekenynge
Right as hys conſciencie | be wreien fhalle
All be it Pope Emperour | or Kynge

|| Who hath wel doon̄ | to lyf predeſtinate
What ioie | what blis | how greet ffelicite
Vn to the ſaued of god | is ordinate
Noo tunge can telle | noon erthly igh may ſee
Ioie | laude Reſt | Pees | and *par*fite vnite
Triumphes of eternalle victorie
With fruicioun | of the Trynite
By contemplacioun | of hys glorie. Deo *grac*ias Amen.

Beside the text of these verses we may now place the account of them (referred to above) which Stow gives in his *Annales of England*. I quote from the edition of 1592[2]:—(p. 624) '... and so [Queen Margaret] was conueyed to the blacke heath, where shee was met by the maior, aldermen & sherifes of the citie in scarlet, & the crafts of the same, all riding on horsebacke, in blew gowns with brodered sleeues, and red hoods, on the 28. of Maie, who conueyed her with her train through Southwarke, and so through the city of London, then beautified with pageants of diuers histories, and other shews of welcome maruellous costly and sumptuous, which I ouerpasse, saue only to name a few. At the bridge foote toward Southwarke, a pageant of peace and plenty, *Ingredimini*, & *replete terram*, and certaine verses in English. Noes ship upon the bridge, *Iam non vltra irascar super terram*, verses in English. At Leden hall, madam Grace chancelor de Dieu, verses in English. At the tunne in Cornehill, of Saint Margaret verses in English. At the great conduit in Cheap of the 5. wise, & 5. foolish virgins, verses in English. At the crosse in Cheap, of the heauenly Jerusalem, verses. At Paules gate, of the generall resurrection and iudgement, with verses accordingly, all made by John Lydgate[3].'

Point by point Stow's statements tally with the text in Harl. 3869. One observes that they agree to the extent of supplying Latin mottoes for the first two pageants but omitting them in the case of the other

[1] This word has been interlined by a different hand of about the same date.

[2] No reference is made to them in the earlier edd. of Stow's 'Chronicle.'

[3] For the first half of the passage quoted Stow follows the phrases of Fabyan's chronicle, though correcting May 18—the date given by Fabyan—to May 28. But Fabyan breaks off his account of the pageants with the words, 'which I ouerpasse.' Stow lingers at this point 'only to name a few,' and it is to him alone that we are indebted for the details which follow.

four. Fortunately, in addition to Stow, we have a piece of contemporary testimony in the *Chronicle* of William Gregory, who in 1451 became Mayor of London. In all probability, therefore, Gregory was an eyewitness of the Queen's entry into the English capital. I quote merely that portion of his account which relates to our present concern:

'And a gayne hyr comynge to London were ordaynyde many notabylle devysys in the cytte, as at the brygge of London, and in othyr dyvers placys, at Ledynne halle, and in Cornehylle, and in iiij placys yn Chepe, that ys to say, at the Grete Condyte, and at the Standarde, and at the Crosse, and atte the Lytylle Condyte. And uppon Thorsday, the xxvj day of May, the Kyng made xlvj Knyghtys of the Bathe yn the Towre of London. And uppon the morowe, that was the Fryday, lordys of the realme, whythe nobylle and grete and costelowe araye, the Mayre of London and the aldyrmen in scharlet, whythe alle the craftys of London in blewe, wythe dyvers dyvysyngys, every crafte to be knowe from othyr, rydyng agayne Quene Margarete and brought hyr unto the Towre of London, the quene havynge whythe hyr xvij charys with ladys[1].' Gregory goes on to speak of the Queen's progress through London on the following day from the Tower to Westminster, but as he makes no reference to any pageant on this occasion, it is clear that the 'devysys' which he mentions were exhibited on Friday on her first entrance into the city.

A somewhat conflicting account of the ceremonies attending the Queen's reception is found in the *English Chronicle*. According to this account the Mayor, Aldermen and Commons met the Queen at Black Heath on Friday and conducted her to the Tower of London, where she rested that night. The pageants and 'devises' were shown on the following afternoon (Saturday) in the course of the Queen's progress from the Tower to Westminster. I quote merely the description of the pageants: 'And by þe wey, as she come þurgh þe Cite, there were shewed and made many devises and storyes, with angeles and oþer hevenly thinges, with songe and melody in dyuers places; and þe condites ran wyne, both white and rede, for all peple þat wold drynk[2].' In placing the pageants on Saturday, when the Queen made her progress through the City to Westminster, instead of placing them

[1] *Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the XV Cent.*, Ed. James Gairdner, Camden Soc. 1876, p. 186.

[2] *The Brut or English Chronicle*, Ed. F. Brie, EETS., 'Continuation F,' p. 489. The briefer account in 'Continuation G' (p. 510) contains nothing of importance for our purpose, though it may be worth noting that 'G' appears to be the source used by Fabyan.

on Friday, when she crossed the Thames and entered the City, the *English Chronicle* is certainly in error. For Saturday's procession started from the Tower and could not, therefore, have followed the route indicated by the Harl. MS.

In their account of the route taken by the Queen Gregory, Stow, and MS. Harl. 3869 are in complete agreement. The royal procession crossed the Thames by London bridge, and moved along Fish Street and Gracechurch Street to Leadenhall at the south-east corner of Gracechurch Street and Cornhill. Turning westward from this point, it passed through Cornhill and Cheapside (or 'West Cheap' as Stow calls it) to the gates of St Paul's. For the church of St Michael at Querne (mentioned in the Harl. MS.) and the Little Conduit[1] (mentioned by Gregory) both stood at the west end of Cheapside just opposite Paules gate (mentioned by Stow), so that the three are only different designations of the same spot.

The stations chosen for the exhibition of the pageants are those which would naturally have been selected. Leadenhall, one of Whittington's gifts to the City, was a favourite site for popular gatherings. Here were held the sports of the 'Lords of Misrule[2]'; here also the people were wont to assemble when serious business engaged their attention[3]. Half-way from Leadenhall to West Cheap stood The Tun—not, as its name might suggest, a tavern, but a prison for petty offenders. Here in 1401 a cistern had been built 'for sweet water conveyed by pipes of lead from Tiborne,' and here was set up a pair of stocks for 'night walkers[4].' Of the stations in 'Cheap' neither the Great Conduit[5] nor 'the Crosse in Chepe' requires comment[6]. Gregory's account makes mention of still another station in the progress through Cheap—'the Standarde,'—which was situated just half-way between the Great Conduit and Chepe Cross, at the same interval which separated the latter from Paules gate. The Standard was famous chiefly for the executions which took place there. It was the spot at which Wat Tyler beheaded several persons, and just five years after Margaret's entry into London it was also the scene of the execution of Lord Say by Jack Cade[7]. Such lugubrious associations, however, probably would not have counted seriously against the Standard

[1] 'The Conduit in West Cheape by Powles gate, was builded about the yeare 1442'—Stow, *Survay of London*, Ed. 1603, p. 17.
[2] *Survay of London*, p. 95.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 160.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 192.
[5] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
[6] The latter marked one of the stations of the bier of Queen Eleanor (*Survay of London*, p. 268).
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 267 f.

as a suitable place for a pageant in the Queen's honour. Our ancestors were more lighthearted than we in the presence of instruments of death. In any case it is difficult to set aside the express statement of Gregory, who was in all probability an eyewitness.

But if we follow Gregory we shall have to regard MS. Harl. 3869, which shows no verses at the Standard, as an incomplete text. Our suspicion that there may be omissions in this MS. is confirmed, moreover, by the blank space (sufficient for two stanzas) for verses to be spoken 'at Draught Brigge.' Evidently the scribe was aware in this case that his source was incomplete, and so left room for the insertion of the missing stanzas later. By the 'draught brigge' undoubtedly was meant the drawbridge at the northern end of London bridge[1]. Pageants were exhibited, therefore, at three points on the bridge: (1) at the Southwark end, (2) at the middle of the bridge (Noes shippe), (3) at the London end.

When we recognize the probable incompleteness of the text of Lydgate's verses preserved in the Harley MS., the close agreement of Stow's account with that manuscript becomes doubly significant. He is unable to add a single detail not found in this manuscript—except the tradition that the author of these verses was John Lydgate. The source of Stow's information, therefore, must have been a copy of these verses quite similar to that in Harl. 3869—if, indeed, we may not suspect that he had access to this identical manuscript.

Obviously Lydgate's verses served as a kind of introduction to the pageants themselves, commending them to the Queen's attention and assuring her of the loyal affection which they were designed to express. These pageants may very likely have been mummings such as were played on other occasions in the royal presence, to which, as we know, Lydgate repeatedly lent his literary talents. Into the question of these pageants, however, I do not wish here to enter, further than to remark that the one exhibited at Leadenhall evidently had as its theme the popular allegory of the Four Daughters of God which frequently made its appearance in the religious drama in both France and England[2].

Carleton Brown.

London.

[1] Cf. *Survay of London*, p. 25.

[2] Cf. Dr Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God*, Bryn Mawr Coll. Monograph, 1907.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Ralph Roister Doister' and 'The Wasps.'

Two passages in *Ralph Roister Doister* seem possibly to have been suggested by *The Wasps* of Aristophanes.

(1) In *Ralph Roister Doister*, III, iii, 80 (cf. v, vi, 22), Mathew Merygreeke, probably accompanying the last word with a stroke, says with one of his characteristic double meanings:

> Good night Roger olde knaue, knaue, knap.

Here the word *knap* seems to mean (i) boy, lad (O.E. *cnapa*), and to be a synonym of *knaue*; (ii) strike.

So, in *The Wasps*, 1307, Xanthias complains of Philocleon:

> κἄτυπτε δή με νεανικῶς, παῖ παῖ καλῶν,

where παῖ seems to be used with reference to a supposed etymological connexion with παίω.

(2) In *Ralph Roister Doister*, III, iii, 113, Mathew Merygreeke, practising Roister Doister in deportment, says:

> Ye must haue a portely bragge after your estate,

and again, l. 121,

> Then must ye stately goe, ietting vp and downe.

So, in a similar passage in *The Wasps*, 1168 f., where Bdelycleon is training his old father in the graces of fashionable life, he says:

> εἶτα πλουσίως
> ὠδὶ προβὰς τρυφερόν τι διασαλακώνισον.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

Notes on 'A Knack to Know an Honest Man.'

(*Malone Society Reprints*, 1910.)

Line 8

> And hide them in the thicket from the Sunne,
> That shine on Venus stately builded towers,...

Read 'shines on Venice.'

16

> But though my mind in recolecting teares,
> With horror dumbe, and eke would choke my tong
> From telling tragike newes, I will begin.

'Teares' does not seem to be the right word. Its presence may be partially explained by reference to line 14, the last word of which is also 'teares.' But probably there was some similarity in the termination which helped to mislead the compositor. Perhaps we should read 'stares'?

31

> Had Venus no other strumpet to content
> Sempronios mind,...

For 'Venus' read 'Venice.'

68

> Downe with the murtherers, fellowes kill his horse.

Seeing that the speaker certainly knows that there was only one slayer, I should correct to 'murtherer.'

337

> Riches are baites to teach us nigardines,...

For 'nigardines' I should read 'nigardnes' as in line 1560—

> And nygardnes was caught by sutteltie.

656

> Go thou to beggerie, Ile to the butcherie,
> The prouerbe is true that I tell to you,
> Tis better to be dronken and drousie,
> Than hunger starued and lousie.

For 'butcherie' read 'butterie.'

705

> Make thou a marble rocke of this white breast,
> Against the sea of euerie loued assault.

The editors suggest 'loue-assault.' I think 'lewd assault' is more in accord with the author's usage.

742

> Yond come the pompious shew.

The editors place 'come' among their doubtful readings: but 'shew' must be taken as collective.

938

> Rather then liue and see me banisht.

Here we should read 'banished'; as also in line 1233, though one must be careful in suggesting alteration of the verse in a play which is full of metrical experiment.

The situation in Scene viii is borrowed from the *Arcadia*.

992. The editors have not included among their irregular readings the s.d. '*Exit omnis*'; nor have they noted the unnecessary colon at the end of line 1004—

> And all the traine of twinckling starres adorne:
> The hollow compasse of our heauens spheare,...
> 1130 I pray thee hold my head.

To avoid ambiguity we must place a comma after 'hold.'

> 1162—63 I told you what would come out,
> He spake as though hee would spit his stomp in my mouth.

For 'out' we possibly should read 'ont,' and for 'stomp' perhaps 'tong.'

> 1233 I am not banisht, you wrong my fames?

See note on line 938. For 'my fames?' read 'me, sonnes.' I believe line 1232, to which this line is a reply, should be ascribed to one of Brishio's sons, and neither to *Brishio*, as in the text, nor to *Lelio*, as the editors suppose.

> 1254 Ashamd, I beg a pardon at thy handes,
> In rendring nature, that hath lost thy power,
> To breed such manslayers in an honest stocke.

Read 'Ingendring nature.'

> 1270 I vow to be as sequest to my Father,...

Read 'to be a free guest'?

> 1331 When as the greatest arts of our age,
> Can neuer make or hardely mend a man.

For 'arts' read 'artist' (*i.e.* physician or surgeon).

> 1356—60 We two deserue to die.
> *Releasing Zepherionio and Orphinio.*
> These prisoners haue done thee honor, for by wounding me
> They have preserud their sister from a rape,
> Me from perpetual shame, thee from much griefe:

According to the editors, the italicized words form part of the preceding line and are not a stage-direction. But the metre proves that this is an error. Properly arranged the verses must run—

> We two deserue to die. These prisoners
> Haue done thee honor, for by wounding me...
> 1392 How do your sighes reuiue my drouping minde?

For 'sighes' read 'sights.'

> 1433—36 *Ze.* Father, the Souldiers tending in his tent,
> Reports that he is gone to Venice,
> [*S*]*em.* Ha ha, midest all these melancolly griefes.
> And with resolued minde to end his daies.

The editors note as irregular the comma after Venice, and consider that 1435—36 are 'out of place unless the lines belong to Brishio.' The comma is quite correct, and only line 1435 is misplaced. It is printed as the first line on the verso of G 2. Looking at the tops of the other pages which were set in the same forme, we see that it ought to have appeared as the first line of the verso of G 4. Here, after a sudden and unexpected turn of fortune, Sempronio makes a characteristic comment—

> *Du*, Then do the Senate presently decree,
> That Lucida shall have the promist coine,
> And Seruio for breaking of the law,
> Shallbe imprisoned for a twelve-month space.
> [*Sem.* Ha ha, midest all these melancolly griefes]
> This pretty accident doth make me laugh.
>
> 1459—61 Stay, stay my sonnes, leaue me some comfort in my age:
> Whether wilt thou transport my zealous minde,
> Let me surfeit in the sinne of loue:

The editors surmise that something has been lost before 1460. More likely we should read 'me, zealous minde.'

1606 Fit we to censure wrongs done to our selues,...

Should this not be—

> Sit we to censure wrongs done to our selues?
>
> 1680—82 We thus conclude,
> That Brishio shall be free from his supposed exile:
> and inioy the goods and fortune he inioyd before,...

Read—

> We thus conclude, that Brishio shall be free
> From his supposed exile, and inioy
> The goods and fortune he inioyd before.
>
> 1703 Since none but Experience
> Hath power to cut off vertues noble head,
> Thou shalt not die.

Read '[Penitent] Experience,' the name assumed by the disguised Sempronio.

1717 Old Sempronio now is young againe,
And dead Sempronio now doth liue,...

Read 'liue [againe].'

1735 my fatall wounds,
Which when I eyed Annetta, I haue wept,...

Insert a comma after 'eyed.'

J. Le Gay Brereton.

Sydney.

Two Notes on 'The Merry Wives of Windsor.'

IV, ii, 46—48.

When Falstaff is caught the second time at Master Ford's house, he exclaims:

> What shall I do?—I'll creep into the chimney.

To which Mrs Ford replies:

> There they always use to discharge their birding-pieces. Creep into the kiln-hole.

It does not concern us here whether the words, 'Creep into the kiln-hole,' really belong to Mrs Page, as Malone conjectured, or not. Many a reader, however, must have been puzzled to know why Master Ford and his brothers should have been in the habit of discharging their guns up the chimney. The only commentator who explains the passage correctly, as far as I have been able to discover, is the late H. C. Hart, who in his edition (1904) of the play in the Arden Shakespeare has the following note to these lines:

'As lately as half a century ago (and perhaps still in some places) it was a common practice in some parts of Ireland, from olden times, to discharge a fowling-piece up the chimney to bring down the soot in gentlemen's houses. I have seen no suggestion as to the sense of Mrs Ford's remark, but this is perhaps what she refers to.'

The purpose of the present note is to point out that the existence in Elizabethan England of the custom which Hart mentions is confirmed by a scene in Middleton and Rowley's *Changeling*, v, 1, which the editors of Shakespeare have overlooked but which makes clear, I think, the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In Middleton and Rowley's play, De Flores, plotting against the life of Diaphanta, the maid of Beatrice, says to the latter (according to the 1653 Quarto, Vol. VI, p. 94 of A. H. Bullen's edition, 8 vols., London, 1885–6),

> I will be ready with a piece high-charg'd
> As 'twere to cleanse the chimney: there 'tis proper now,
> But she shall be the mark.

Accordingly a few lines later on we have the stage-direction: 'Enter Deflores with a piece' [i.e. gun] (Quarto of 1653), whereupon Vermandero asks him: 'Knave whither goes that piece?' and De Flores replies: 'To scour the chimney.'

IV, v, 69—72.

In the affair in which the Host is robbed of his horses Sir Hugh Evàns says to that worthy:

> Have a care of your entertainments: there is a friend of mine come to town, tells me there is three cozen-germans that has cozened all the hosts of Readins, of Maidenhead, of Colebrook, of horses and money, etc.

The Quarto of 1602 (see W. W. Greg's edition, Clarendon Press, 1910, p. 48), however, gives Sir Hugh here the following speech:

> Where is mine host of the gartyr?
> Now my Host I would desire you looke you now,
> To have a care of your entertainments,
> For there is three sorts of garmombles,
> Is cosen all the Host of Maidenhead & Readings,
> Now you are an honest man and a scuruy beggerly lowsie knave beside:
> And can point wrong places,
> I tell you for good will, grate why my Host.

Ever since the suggestion was first made by Charles Knight in his Pictorial Edition of Shakespeare's Works, 1838–43, the majority of scholars have accepted the view that the passage about the stolen horses with its allusions to the 'cozen-germans' and 'garmombles' (Quarto, 1602) was a reminiscence of the visit of the Count of Mümpelgart (Mompelgard)—afterwards Duke of Würtemberg and Teck—to England in 1592. He was allowed by official order to take up post-horses and pay nothing for the same, which, no doubt, caused much dissatisfaction among the inn-keepers.

Leaving aside the question of the authenticity of the Quarto text, let us consider the singular word 'garmombles' which it offers. Dr Greg says (p. 86):

'If "garmombles" is anything but a wild blunder of the compositor, it must be not a fragment of the original text but a sly allusion to the censored episode introduced by the actor (an Elizabethan Pelissier) for the benefit of an audience familiar with current dramatic scandal.'

Again, in his *England as seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London, 1865), which contains a translation of the journal of the Count's travels in England, W. B. Rye says (Introduction, p. xcviii):

'We would ask now whether this term *garmombles* used by Shakespeare can by any possibility be intended for anything else but a playful joke upon the Duke's title of Mompelgard—a joke which would have had a peculiar relish for the members of a court to whom the German had recently paid a visit; but if the word be archaic, and a meaning can be found for it, we are willing to yield the point.'

That 'garmombles,' however, is not a compositor's blunder but a genuine archaic or dialectic word whose meaning suits well with the context of the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is evident, I believe, from the following lines of the early Elizabethan play, *Misogonus*, II, iii, 78 f., where Liturgus says:

> I warrent you I heis nether wounded nor slayne,
> had a litle girmumble I thinke & no more.

The passage may be most conveniently consulted in R. Warwick Bond's *Early Italian Plays* (Oxford, 1911), p. 202. Mr Bond has the following note (p. 310) to 'girmumble':

'"*Jurmungle* obs. sb. Yks. A mess, confusion." *D.D.*: also as obs. Scotch verb and sb. *Jurmummle*, crushing, disfiguring.'

But Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* also gives as a meaning of *jurmummle* 'to bamboozle,' which fits better with the context of the passage in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. There is accordingly a play on words in the 'garmombles' of the Quarto, just as there is in the 'cozen-Iermans' of the Folio. That 'garmombles' is a genuine word does not conflict, however, in any way, as Rye seemed to think, with the idea that it was also intended as a hit at the German prince through a metathesis of the syllables that make up his name. Quite the contrary.

J. Douglas Bruce.

Knoxville, Tennessee, U.S.A.

Drummond and Browne.

In the *Modern Language Review* for July, 1911, Professor Kastner printed a number of unpublished poems from the Hawthornden MSS. for which we owe him many thanks. But despite the precautions 'taken to preclude any such contingency' he included the well-known colloquy of Sir Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici*. The error has recently been corrected (January, 1911), and the matter might have been passed over apart from the interesting fact that there are some differences between the two texts.

For purposes of comparison with Professor Kastner's text I append the version given in the pirated edition of the *Religio Medici* (1642):

> The night is come like to the day,
> Depart not thou great God away.
> Let not my sinnes, blacke as the night,
> Eclipse the lustre of thy light.
> Keepe still in my Horizon, for to me,
> The Sun makes not the day, but thee.
> Thou whose nature cannot sleepe,
> On my temples centry keepe;

Guard me 'gainst those watchfull foes,
Whose eyes are open, while mine close.
Let not dreames my head infest,
But such as Jacobs temples blest.
While I doe rest, my soule advance,
Make me sleepe a holy trance:
That I may take my rest being wrought,
Awake into some holy thought.
And with as active vigor run
My course, as doth the nimble Sun.
Sleepe is a death, O make me try,
By sleeping what it is to dye.
And downe as gently lay my head
On my Grave, as now my Bed.
Howere refresh'd, great God let me
Awake againe at last with thee.
And thus assur'd, behold I lie
Securely, or to wake or die.
These are my drowsie dayes, in vaine
I doe now wake to sleepe againe.
O come that houre, when I shall never
Sleepe thus againe but wake for ever.

In 1643 Browne issued 'a full and intended copy of that peece which was most imperfectly and surreptitiously published before.' The version of the 'night piece' differs slightly from that given above. Apart from unimportant differences of spelling the following changes occur: l. 11 'no dreames,' l. 14 'my sleepe,' l. 15 'That I may, my rest being wroght,' l. 21 'And as gently lay my head,' l. 23 'Howere I rest, great God let me,' l. 30 'sleepe againe.' It is obvious that the change in l. 15 is an improvement from the point of view of sense, and the same is perhaps true of l. 23.

Drummond's version seems, on the whole, to follow that of the 1642 edition, cf. ll. 15 and 23, but he is rightly offended by the ungrammatical 'thee,' found in both the 1642 and 1643 texts of the *Religio Medici*, and changes to 'thou' (l. 6).

Professor Kastner points out that Drummond was 'so accustomed to transcribe passages or entire poems from all kinds of authors, that of the unpublished pieces here selected one or two may be found to which the Scottish poet has no better claim than that of being an amanuensis.' In the present instance, the amanuensis has managed to introduce one improvement. We may note, as a piece of contemporary criticism, that Sir Kenelm Digby in his 'Observations upon Religio Medici' (1643) alludes to the poem in the following lukewarm terms: 'In his concluding prayer, wherein he summeth up all he wisheth; me thinketh his arrow is not winged with that fire which I should have expected from him upon this occasion.'

P. G. Thomas.

London.

Dante and the 'Mahabharata.'

The first recorded reference to the *Mahabharata*—that great collection of Indian epic poetry described as 'a heterogeneous mass of legendary and didactic matter, worked into and around a central heroic narrative'—is met with in the fifth century B.C., but, as Professor Macdonell remarks in his *History of Sanscrit Literature*, it may, owing to the immemorial practice of recitation, have been in use long before it began to be recorded. In the form in which we know it, it has not changed since about 500 A.D. To give some idea of its length, it may be recalled that it is nearly eightfold that of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* combined.

It has been noted by M. Vitti in *L' Alghieri* (1889), and M. de Gubernatis in the *Giornale Dantesco*, vol. III, and by other scholars, that there may be links connecting the *Mahabharata* with the *Divina Commedia*. The suggestions of MM. Vitti and de Gubernatis have, however, been wholly denied by M. Blochet in his scholarly work, *Les sources orientales de la Divina Commedia*. He says: 'Le Mahabharata n'a certainement rien à voir avec l'œuvre de Dante.' It is therefore with some diffidence that I venture to draw attention to one point which I think has not hitherto been noticed, but which seems to suggest an opposite conclusion. Judging from medieval literature generally, with its apparent delight in the gruesome and horrible, its supreme interest in the future, and its teaching that, for the vast majority of mankind, death is but the beginning of endless tortures, such descriptions as the *Mahabharata* gives of the nether world are such as could not have failed to make a deep impression, and although Sanscrit scholars are agreed that not even so much as an abstract of the *Mahabharata* could have been known in Europe in the Middle Ages, it seems not only possible, but also probable, that writers may have acquired some hearsay knowledge of its plot through the Arabs, those great disseminators of Oriental thought.

With the complicated series of histories of which the *Mahabharata* is composed, largely the result of accretions due to constant recitation, we are not here concerned, but only with certain episodes towards the end of it. The last two books, or 'parvas,' of the *Mahabharata*, called respectively 'The Great Journey,' and 'The Entry into Heaven[1],' tell how the king Yudhisthura, sovereign of all the known earth, lays aside

[1] Mahāprasthānika Parva, Sect. 1, and Swargarohanika Parva, Sect. 2. The quotations are taken from the translation by Pratapa Chandra Ray.

his sceptre ere death comes to him, and, accompanied by his wife, his brethren, and a dog, sets out for Mount Meru, the Heavenly Mountain, where dwell the Gods. On the way, his human companions sink down and die, and the King and the dog alone arrive at the foot of the mountain. Upon his refusal, even at the risk of thereby losing Heaven, to comply with the request of the Gods—who desire to test his loyalty—that he should abandon the faithful dog that has followed him throughout his journey, the dog is transformed into the God of Justice, and now nothing seems left to prevent his attainment of the Celestial goal. But on the threshold he hesitates, for he cannot see those whom on Earth he has held most dear. 'This is not Heaven,' he exclaims, 'I wish not to stay here. That is Heaven where those brethren of mine are.' The Gods, unable to dissuade him, and 'ready to do what is agreeable' to him, command a celestial messenger to show him his friends and kinsmen. He now enters on 'a path difficult and inauspicious, and enveloped in thick darkness.' It is called 'the Sinners' Way,' and led to the lower sphere, and, as described in the *Mahabharata*, 'it abounded with gadflys and stinging bees and gnats...it was noisome with worms and insects.'

In passing, but without specially emphasizing the point, we may recall Dante's vision of the cowardly neutrals (*Inf.*, iii, 65) 'in the starless air,' just within Hell's gate, 'these unfortunates were sorely goaded by hornets and wasps that were there. These made their faces stream with blood, which, mixed with tears, was gathered at their feet by loathsome worms' (Carlyle's trans.). Here Dante gives the same idea, but raised by his dramatic imagination to the acme of horror.

Returning to the *Mahabharata*[1], we read that, proceeding through a region abounding in every sort of foulness, Yudhisthura 'beheld a river full of boiling water, and therefore difficult to cross, as also a forest of trees whose leaves were sharp swords and razors. There were plains full of fine white sand, exceedingly heated.' It is to these last three incidents, the boiling river, the forest of sword-leaved trees, and the desert of fiery sand, and to their sequence, that I wish specially to draw attention, for when we turn to the *Inferno*, Cantos xii, xiii, and xiv, we find not only that the three incidents there set out bear a striking resemblance to those quoted from the *Mahabharata*, but that they are recorded in the same sequence, although it is true that in the *Mahabharata* the direful situations are given without details, whereas, with Dante, the development of horrors seems almost to run riot. To

[1] Swargarohanika Parva, Sect. 2, ver. 23 and 24.

the river of boiling water, difficult to cross, of the *Mahabharata*, there corresponds the river of boiling blood which Dante could only cross with miraculous assistance. To the forest of trees whose leaves were sharp swords and razors, there corresponds the Forest of Suicides, whose trees were pronged with poisoned, withered sticks. To the plains of sand, exceedingly heated, there corresponds the Desert of Fiery Sand (*Inf.*, xiv, 28 and 37), 'Over all the great sand, falling slowly, rained dilated flakes of fire,' and 'So fell the eternal heat, by which the sand was kindled.'

Each situation may, indeed, be to some extent paralleled in medieval literature, whilst the Forest of Suicides finds a possible prototype in the *Aeneid*, though it is worthy of note that the tree-imprisoned soul of Polydorus cries out 'Harvests of iron have sprouted and grown with spears from my heart,' which comes closer to the sharp swords and razors of the *Mahabharata* than to the withered sticks of Dante.

In an age overwhelmed with a tremendous sense of sin, death, and judgment, to dwell in thought on prospective suffering seemed a wholesome discipline, and therefore if Dante, by his rendering, raises the sense of the awful to white heat, he is only expressing the feeling of the time, intensified by a poet's inspiration.

The incidents above quoted from the *Mahabharata* and Dante respectively correspond so closely as regards matter, and so absolutely as regards sequence, that it is very difficult to believe that even if Dante elaborated his ideas from other more accessible sources, as, for instance, the Vision of Alberico, monk of Cassino, which tells, though not in sequence, of a river of blood, and a forest of sharp and thorny trees, his arrangement of the three consecutive incidents referred to, in three consecutive cantos, was not suggested by some knowledge, however indirect, of the *Mahabharata*.

Alice Kemp-Welch.

London.

REVIEWS.

The Tragedies of Seneca translated into English Verse. By Frank Justus Miller. Introduced by an essay on the influence of the tragedies of Seneca upon early English drama, by John Matthews Manly. Chicago: University Press. 1907. 8vo. ix + 534 pp.

So much attention has been directed in recent years to the influence of Seneca's tragedies on the Elizabethan drama by such works as Fischer's *Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie* and Cunliffe's *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, that any attempt to make the tragedies themselves familiar to the student of English literature is to be heartily welcomed. English translations of Seneca's plays are not numerous. The *Tenne Tragedies of Seneca* (1581) by Heywood, Neville, Newton, Nuce, and Studley; W. Bradshaw's prose rendering of the collected plays (1902); and Dr Ella Harris's verse translation (1904) exhaust the list, I believe[1]. Of these the last-mentioned is the only one which gives any real help to the student of English literature whose Latin has grown rusty, and this translation by Mr Miller possesses certain valuable features, viz. the introductory essay by Prof. Manly, comparative analyses of plays and a mythological index, which are lacking to Dr Harris's excellent version.

Mr Miller has used blank verse for the dramatic portions of all the plays except the *Medea*, and on the whole he has handled it with skill, though there are some heavy and prosaic passages. The rendering of the speech of Hippolytus in praise of the simple life (*Hipp.* 484—564) may be taken as a favourable specimen of his powers. The experiment made in *Medea* of reproducing the iambic trimeter of the original is not attended with much success, as the translator himself admits in his preface. The lyric portions of the ten plays have been rendered in a variety of metres, and in these Mr Miller's touch is very uncertain. What is to be said of this chorus from *Medea*:

> The fairest of girls is she,
> The Athenian maids outshining,
> Or the Spartan maiden with armor laden,
> No burden of war declining.
>
> Not by Alpheus' sacred stream,
> Nor Bœotia's musical water,
> Is there any fair who can compare
> With our lovely Corinthian daughter.

(*Medea*, 75—82.)

[1] This list does not include versions of separate plays, of which several examples may be found in the seventeenth and succeeding centuries.

The famous prophecy in the same play:

> Venient annis saecula seris,
> quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
> laxet et ingens pateat tellus,
> Tethysque novos detegat orbes
> nec sit terris ultima Thule

which ought to have peculiar interest for one of Mr Miller's nationality, is very tamely and ineffectively rendered. At times the translator's use of colloquialisms in the midst of speeches written otherwise in dignified English, jars somewhat on the ear; and there are a few annoying misprints, e.g. 'acocunt' for 'account' (*Œd.* 709), 'be' for 'he' (*Medea*, 652).

The translation is fairly accurate, though one or two blunders may be noted.

> No sinner seeks to shirk his punishment
> (*Herc. Œt.* 899.)

is a strange version of

> Nemo nocens sibi ipse poenas abrogat,

which Dr Harris renders correctly as

> He who sins
> May not himself annul the punishment.

(The Elizabethan translation, following the reading 'inrogat' for 'abrogat,' renders the passage 'No gylty one doth use To take reuenge-mente of themselues.')

The whole of the dialogue between Hyllus and Deianira is poorly translated by Mr Miller.

> Whoe'er ignores his fate and spares himself,
> Deservedly has erred, deserves to die
> (*Herc. Œt.* 887—8.)

is not an adequate rendering of

> Quicumque fato ignoscit et parcit sibi
> errare meruit: morte damnari placet.

Sometimes Seneca's dialogue loses its point through the translator's failure to keep the Latin play upon words. Thus Mr Miller renders

> *Thes.* Lacrimae nonne te nostrae movent?
> *Ph.* Mors optima est perire lacrimandum suis
> (*Hipp.* 880—1.)

by

> *Th.* Will not my tears avail with thee?
> *Ph.* That death is best which one's own friends lament.

Prof. Manly contributes an excellent introductory essay on the influence of Seneca's tragedies on early English drama, and at the end of the book there is a helpful table of comparison between Seneca's plays and their Greek originals.

Perhaps one suggestion for future editions may be added. Since the intrinsic literary value of Seneca's tragedies is so small, and it is certain that henceforth their importance will lie chiefly in their relation to the Elizabethan drama, would it not be useful to add foot-notes giving alternative renderings in those places where the Elizabethan editions of the text differ from Leo's, which Mr Miller has followed? It is true that the Elizabethan translators of Seneca made use of two or three Latin editions, as has been pointed out by E. Jockers in his dissertation *Die englischen Seneca-Übersetzer*, but the variations of text in these are generally unimportant, and Cunliffe's example might well be followed in taking the Aldine of Avantius (1517) as representing fairly the text of Seneca as known to the Elizabethans.

Evelyn M. Spearing.

Cambridge.

The Hexaplar Psalter, being the Book of Psalms in Six English Versions. Edited by William Aldis Wright. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 4to. vi + 390 pp.

The history of the English versions of the Psalms is particularly interesting, and the Cambridge University Press has conferred a benefit on the public by issuing this Hexapla as part of the commemoration of the Bible tercentenary. It is edited by Mr Aldis Wright, whose knowledge of the subject and scholarly accuracy are unsurpassed, and it contains in parallel columns the six principal translations of the Psalms which belong to the period of printing, viz. those of Coverdale's Bible, 1535, of the Great Bible, 1539, of Geneva, 1560, of the Bishops' Bible, 1568, of the Authorised Version, 1611, and of the Revised Version, 1885. Coverdale's original version, on which he evidently bestowed exceptional pains, was founded upon a combination of the two principal German translations with that of the Vulgate. Mr Aldis Wright refers briefly in his Preface to the question of the 'five sundry interpreters' whose authority Coverdale alleges in the Dedication of his Bible, and apparently thinks it necessary to suppose that five were actually used in the Psalms. But when Coverdale mentions his five interpreters, it is in reference to the Bible generally, and Tindale may well have been one of them, though the translator could get no assistance from him in the Psalter. Pagninus may also have been one; but of him Coverdale actually made little use. It would be interesting to know on what grounds Mr Wright suggests Jerome's so-called 'Versio Hebraica' as one of the authorities used here by Coverdale. In his translation of the Psalms Coverdale evidently aimed from the first at such rhythmical smoothness as would render them suitable for singing, and this aim was pursued still further in the Great Bible, where we have Coverdale's own revision of his earlier work, with the help of Münster's Latin version. He does not scruple to make additions purely with this object, as where he writes, 'God is a ryghteous iudge *strong and pacient*,' for 'God is a

rightuous iudge,' or 'there is not one that doth good, *no not one*,' for 'there is not one that doth good.' Admirable as his final version is, there were many who thought that he had gone much too far in the sacrifice of sense to sound, and the reviser of the Psalms for the Bishops' Bible, after protesting against this in a special preface, set to work with a very different method from that which was pursued in most of the other books of the Bible, altering almost every verse, and evidently preferring to destroy the established rhythm, even when no difference was made in the meaning. Where Coverdale had written, 'O ye sonnes of men, how longe wyll ye blaspheme myne honour? and haue soch pleasure in vanyte, and seke after lesyng?' he has 'O ye sonnes of men, how long [wyll ye go about to bryng] my glory to confusion? ye loue vanitie, ye seeke after lyes': where Coverdale says 'consydre my meditacion' (with which the Authorised and Revised Versions agree), he has 'vnderstande thou my pensifnesse': where Coverdale has 'longe sufferynge, and of great goodnesse,' he prefers 'loth to be angry, and exceedyng great in mercie.' No doubt his version is more correct, but it is full of gratuitous awkwardness, and in the later editions of the Bishops' Bible it was thought advisable to print the singing version with it in parallel columns. The Authorised Version returns in a very large number of instances to the abandoned phraseology of the Great Bible in the Psalter, a circumstance which is hardly found in the translation of any other book of the Bible; but of course the Geneva Bible had its influence also, and it was probably understood by that time that in the services of the Church the Great Bible Psalms would continue to be used, and therefore the requirements of singing need no longer be specially kept in view.

In his Appendix Mr Aldis Wright, besides collecting the marginal readings of the six texts, gives all the variations of the two later editions of Coverdale's Bible, as compared with that of 1535, of the six editions of the Great Bible, from April 1540 to Dec. 1541, as compared with that of 1539, and of the two first editions (1568 and 1569) of the Bishops' Bible. Unsparing labour such as this, demanding the greatest care and accuracy, and asking for no reward except the pleasure of doing sound work, deserves the special acknowledgement of scholars.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Life in Shakespeare's England. A Book of Elizabethan Prose. Compiled by John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: University Press. 1911. 8vo. xvi + 292 pp.

Mr Wilson's aim is to set before us the England that Shakespeare knew in a series of descriptive extracts drawn from contemporary writers. His book is admirably planned and admirably executed. His wide knowledge of Elizabethan literature and his appreciation of its human side are put to good use in his selection of illustrative passages

and it was a particularly happy thought to group these passages in relation to Shakespeare. No student of Elizabethan history or literature but will be the better for having seen Elizabethan life under Mr Wilson's guidance.

The main sections of the book are entitled respectively 'England and the English,' 'The Country-side,' 'Superstition,' 'Education,' 'London,' 'Books and Authors,' 'The Theatre,' 'The Court,' 'House and Home,' 'Rogues and Vagabonds,' 'The Sea,' while a happy conclusion is found in Nicholas Breton's account of 'An Elizabethan Day.' We need not mention all the authors whom Mr Wilson calls in to fill up his pictures: when however we say that they include Ascham, Lyly, Sidney, Lodge, Nashe, Dekker, Raleigh, Hakluyt, Overbury, Earle, Joseph Hall, Fynes Morison, Coryat, W. Harrison, G. Markham, P. Stubbes, R. Scot, W. Bullein, Stow, J. Howell and Fuller, it will be seen at once that the book apart from its particular theme, forms an admirable introduction to the prose-writers of the Elizabethan age. We cannot think that a schoolboy will find any page of the book dull, though he will perhaps be most pleased with the racy extract from Harman's *Caveat for Common Cursetors.* And everywhere he will catch from the vigorous and imaginative English of these selected passages something of the warmth and glow and energy of the greatest age that England has known.

What faults we find are of a very minor kind. Mr Wilson has added to his selection eight pages of 'Glossary and Notes.' It seems to us that it would have been better if these notes had been rather more numerous, even if one or two passages in the book had been sacrificed to make the required space, for example that on page 105 which relates to Germany rather than England and part of that on p. 164 which describes the dress of Venetian courtezans. The passages abound in obsolete expressions, which will not be intelligible to the ordinary reader, and if there is to be a Glossary to the book at all, it should include more of these than it does. I need only mention 'manured' (p. 7) (= handled), 'merchants by the great' (p. 8), 'harlots' (p. 96) (used of men), 'carted' (p. 102), 'an embossment in terrace work' (p. 119), 'sirreverence' (p. 127), 'by slot' (p. 166), 'in print' (p. 174). The expression 'to cry creak' (p. 20) is not adequately explained by the note in the Glossary, 'Creak. The cry of a cock.' The allusion to woolpacks as the foundation of a bridge (p. 20) needed a note.

The text of certain passages presents difficulty. Occasionally Mr Wilson has suggested an emendation in brackets, occasionally he has left the difficulty unsolved. One or two of his emendations are doubtful: thus (p. 14) it is not necessary to alter 'being' to 'seeing' in the sentence 'ignorance will not suffer her to do ill, being her mind is to do well,' nor (p. 219) to alter 'associate' to 'associate with' in the phrase 'to associate the nobleman.' (Cp. p. 248, 'I would have him to associate me thither.')

Among passages which seem to need emendation is one on p. 101.

'When the bell-man for anger to spite (such a purloiner of citizens' goods) so many, hath bounced at the door like a madman.' Mr Wilson suggests 'spy' for 'spite,' but even so the sentence seems to be faulty. Should it stand 'such a purloiner of so many citizens' goods'?

On p. 137 the word 'wrote' seems required before 'to one Pison.' On p. 111, l. 8 from bottom, 'raking' should perhaps be 'taking,' and on p. 112, l. 11, 'trumpets' should be 'strumpets.'

Mr Wilson appends to his extracts the date of the edition of the book used, and generally that of the first edition as well, if he used a later one. One might wish that in some cases he had also given the approximate date of composition—as that is the material thing in connexion with an account of English life. From this point of view it is misleading to have Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum* dated 1583 instead of c. 1551 and King James' *Counterblast* 1672 instead of 1604.

These small points would not be worth mentioning but for the fact that Mr Wilson has produced a charming and scholarly work, which deserves to be read by all who are interested in Shakespeare and his age, and which should hold its ground for many years to come.

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

Literary Criticism from the Elizabethan Dramatists. By David Klein. New York: Sturgis & Walton. 1910. 8vo. xviii + 257 pp.

Whatever else Dr Klein has done in this work he has collected a number of passages from the Elizabethan dramatists which go to illustrate their dramatic theory and practice; and in view of the failure on the part of the contemporary critics to pronounce at all adequately upon the popular drama of the day, these passages are of considerable interest as supplementing in some measure what these critics had to say. Critical utterances of this casual kind were perhaps the natural outcome of the literary conditions which then prevailed, for the rise of the new drama implied a continuous exercise of the critical faculty. Each new and experimental form argued a more or less reasoned departure from earlier method and consequently the dramatist often permitted himself the liberty of putting into the mouths of his characters certain views which he, the dramatist, held concerning his craft. In any case the practice seems to have been common and Dr Klein has cast his net fairly wide, paying, as was natural, chief attention to Shakespeare and Jonson, but taking care as well to look both before and after.

It may however be doubted whether the somewhat formal classification he adopts and to which he rigidly adheres was best calculated to serve the purpose he had in view. It has its advantages in introducing a certain amount of method into the inquiry: but, on the other hand, ideas on literature can scarcely be pigeon-holed in this rigorous fashion. At any rate, something is undoubtedly lost in a process which could

not help passing over much of that implicit criticism which is everywhere present in the Elizabethan drama and of which Chaucer, in his *Sir Thopas* has given an earlier example; for instance Shakespeare's disguised pronouncements in *As You Like It* and *The Winter's Tale* on pastoralism in literature, the burlesque of romance in a play like *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, or the demand made by the domestic plays for familiar events and for language plain and unadorned.

Then again Dr Klein is not always happy in interpreting a critical statement. He sees in Polonius' 'humorous enumeration of mongrels' merely an expression of disapproval with regard to 'the incongruous mingling practised by the earlier dramatists.' But more than this is surely involved in the passage. Shakespeare's list of 'pastoral-comical, historical-comical' and the rest is not pure fooling, it embodies a positive truth, stating in effect that the new drama could not be partitioned out into the ancient kinds but that its elements were to be as mixed as life itself. In dealing with another of Shakespeare's enigmatic utterances—those words of Theseus relating to poetry and the imagination—a passage so often misquoted and misunderstood, Dr Klein is rather more successful. He allows for the dramatic quality of the speech but rashly concludes that it is 'the essential emptiness of poetry [that] is here insisted on.' The passage is, in truth, a thorny one: it required a more than careful handling, and Professor Mackail's elucidation of the speech in his recent volume *Lectures on Poetry* will be welcomed by all students of literature.

But while this work of Dr Klein's bears the marks of considerable industry and contains the fruit of careful search and thought, it must be added that it suffers badly in the matter of presentment, more particularly in the style and tone which the writer, in his occasional comment, has chosen to adopt. Coleridge is stated to have thought a certain speech 'just great.' Scaliger is said 'to have gone back of Aristotle to the practice of Aischylos.' Speaking of the fate which overtook Jonson's commentary on Horace, the writer expresses a wish that 'it had not been destroyed in that confounded conflagration.' These things are perhaps a matter of taste, but they appear to be out of place in what professes to be a work of scholarship; they suggest a levity of treatment that is not in accordance with the rest of the work. In Dr Klein's repertory of critical utterances there is much that will prove useful to later workers in the same field; and it is upon the merits of this collection that Dr Klein would have judgment passed. All the same, one could have wished this phraseology away, while equally desirable would have been the addition of an index at the end of the work for purposes of reference. The absence of this index is a grave defect. The bibliography which takes up the last few pages will doubtless prove useful, but then it is not an index.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

The Serpent of Division, by John Lydgate. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossary by H. N. MacCracken. Oxford: University Press. 1911. 4to. 75 pp.

Dr MacCracken's edition of Lydgate's *Serpent of Division* is a careful and scholarly piece of work which has the merit of having rendered accessible to students of English an interesting prose work of the early fifteenth century, 'the only well-authenticated prose work,' in fact, which came from the pen of Lydgate. The text has a further interest in that it contains the most extensive treatment of Julius Caesar in the whole range of Middle English literature; and while its popularity as a political tract seems to have lasted well on into the sixteenth century, if we are to judge from the printed fragments still extant, its theme, the dangers of national division, was frequently repeated at a later date and appears for instance in the early play of *Gorboduc*. No great artistic merits can perhaps be claimed for the tract; its prose style is no better and no worse than that of the average fifteenth century production. On the other hand Lydgate's material is of considerable interest. It is drawn from various sources with judgment and care, and the editor in tracking his author through the ample medieval chronicles has supplied an interesting as well as a useful commentary upon medieval methods of work. In short the editorial labours leave little to be desired. The best work is perhaps done in the careful elucidation of these sources: but the text, notes and glossary are all good, clear and concise (there is apparently a misprint of *wrowt* for *wrowȝt* on p. 53, l. 1); and the edition is made attractive in another sense, by the inclusion of three very choice full-page reproductions of contemporary MS. pictures taken from the Yates Thomson MS. of *Li Fait des Romains*.

There is one matter however, and that a rather important one, where the editor appears to be at fault, namely, in the date which he assigns to the composition of the work. All four MSS. belong to the second half of the fifteenth century but at the end of the text in the Calthorpe MS. there is the following significant statement: 'The forseide division so to schewe I have remembred this forseid littil translacion. The moneth of Decembre, the ffirste yere of oure sovereigne lord that now ys king henry the vj^{te}.' And, then again, in the colophon of the same MS. (Calthorpe) the date 1400 is found. So that there seem to be two possible dates: the year 1422 (i.e. the first year of the reign of Henry VI) and secondly, the date 1400; and it is the later of these dates upon which Dr MacCracken has fixed, in spite of the awkward evidence of the colophon.

In the first place he rightly rejects the idea of reading Henry IV instead of Henry VI in the passage already quoted. This change would not clear the matter up, while it would imply not only a conceivable scribal slip (the numeral IV having been read as VI), but also a substitution of the abbreviation *-te* for the *-þe* which would have appeared with IV^{þe}. But when he proceeds to dismiss the possibility

of the date 1400 on the ground that Chaucer is referred to as 'some one long dead' his argument is scarcely in keeping with the facts. Chaucer is mentioned (p. 65) as one 'þat was flowre of poetis...þe firste þat euer enluminede owre langage,...my maistere Chaucere which compendiously wrote þe deþe of þis miȝte Emperour.' This description does not necessarily refer to one 'long dead.' It is quite conceivable that Lydgate writing in 1400 would speak in similar terms of his master who had died in the December of the preceding year (1399).

Nor is the evidence of the colophon contradicted by the interesting fact which Dr MacCracken brings forward for that purpose, namely, that at the end of the *Story of Thebes* we find Lydgate developing a train of thought similar to that of the *Serpent of Division* and developing it moreover in language closely parallel. The *Story* was completed somewhere between the years 1421 and 1425, and it certainly seems possible that in this passage Lydgate may have been making use of an earlier work of his, the *Serpent of Division* for instance, supposing it to have been written in 1400. And even supposing its date of composition to have been 1422, the *Story* may, notwithstanding, have been the work indebted, for, as has already been stated, the *Story* was not certainly completed until 1425.

On the other hand things become rather more plain if we accept the date (1400) given by the colophon as the year of composition. Then in the year 1422, a year of political unrest owing to the death of Henry V, it may well have been that the time seemed to Lydgate to call for the reappearance of a political tract which contained such seasonable counsel as the *Serpent of Division*, and that he was therefore induced to reproduce that earlier work of his. Supposing that revision to have been made in 1422, it would account for the interesting parallel already mentioned in the *Story of Thebes*; the thought and the diction of the prose pamphlet would be fresh in Lydgate's memory when he proceeded with the completion of that poem. But some such revision seems to have been actually made. As Dr MacCracken himself states, one particular MS. (the Calthorpe) shows modernising tendencies, a statement that is readily corroborated by a reference to the variant readings contained in the footnotes of his edition. The text of that particular MS., moreover, ends with the quotation 'I have remembred this forseid littil translacion'; a statement which in its very wording seems to imply some such process of revision. And lastly it is at the end of this passage, which is peculiar to the Calthorpe MS., that the year 1422 is substantially quoted; a date which must therefore be regarded as the date of a reproduction, while to the year 1400 must be assigned the original composition of the work.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

Selected Dramas of John Dryden with the Rehearsal by George Villiers Duke of Buckingham. Edited with Introduction and Notes by GEORGE R. NOYES. Chicago and New York: Scott, Foresman & Co. 1910. 8vo. lvi + 504 pp.

This volume, the product of much labour, will be most acceptable to the student and is not to be repelled even by the general reader who has any curiosity in the history of literature. The four plays which Professor Noyes selects to represent Dryden's dramatic work are the *Conquest of Granada* (both parts), *Marriage à la Mode*, *All for Love*, and the *Spanish Friar*. It does not appear that the selection could be better. Besides a carefully formed text of the four plays and of the *Rehearsal*, the inclusion of which is of considerable additional interest to the book, the volume contains notes, printed separately at the end, on all five plays, and also, by way of introduction to the whole, an elaborate essay of near fifty pages on Dryden as dramatist, followed by a careful chronological list of the dramatic works.

Professor Noyes cannot be accused of exaggerating the attractions of his subject. He appraises most modestly the general interest for modern readers of the Restoration Literature and states temperately and frankly the solid objections to which Dryden as a dramatic artist is open. On the former point indeed, the interest of Dryden at large and of the period which he ruled, we would fain hope that the editor goes beyond the necessary limit of depression. With the rarest exceptions no past age, if we may speak candidly, commands or will command for such poetry either a numerous or a very studious public. But the little labour and the little use of a slight exercise of imagination necessary to the full enjoyment and comprehension of *Absalom and Achitophel* will surely not be grudged in this country, though in America competing interests, if we do not misunderstand the editor, threaten to stifle even this.

Of Professor Noyes' present volume the notes perhaps are the most valuable part; but they do not afford material for such discussion as is possible here. In all that concerns the formation of the text the work seems to be admirably thorough. The notes on language are interesting and useful, so far as they go; of explanation most readers, I think, will want rather more than they will find.

The introductory essay with its footnotes offers a full account of the subject and a valuable collection of references. It abounds of course in points open to discussion. For the most part I find no ground of objection. One may perhaps be surprised, considering the proportions of the whole work, by the space allotted (pp. xxxv ff.) to the unfortunate controversy with Settle about *The Empress of Morocco* and Dryden's part in the miserable railing of the anonymous *Notes and Observations* of 1674. Professor Noyes warns us indeed himself that 'as this work was a joint production, we cannot be sure that Dryden wrote any particular part of it' but he adds that 'as he undoubtedly read and

approved the whole, the question is of little moment; we may regard the opinions in general of the pamphlet as Dryden's own,' and he immediately proceeds to quote some scurrilous and clumsy passages with confident attribution to our poet. Unless the editor relies upon some evidence which I do not apprehend, this seems to go rather far, especially as the tone and style of the citations offer, as Professor Noyes points out, most striking contrast to Dryden's treatment of similar topics in his acknowledged work.

The specimen of Dryden's verbal criticism, cited for the purpose of this comparison, is from the preface of *The State of Innocence*—the defence of the metaphor in

> Seraph and Cherub careless of their charge...
> Unguarded leave the passes of the sky
> And all dissolv'd in Hallelujahs lie.

Dryden's critic is crude enough and Dryden's rebuke very dignified, but if Professor Noyes means to imply that it is adequate, we may hesitate to follow him. Certainly Dryden's quotation from Virgil 'Invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam' is no justification, nor do I for a moment believe that Dryden, as he says, took from it his own expression. It is one of the off-hand metaphors with which his critical works abound. In style and suggestiveness these cannot be over-praised, but in regard to their substance and principles the late flow of opinion in their favour seems to have gone quite far enough. The opinions which Dryden expresses are as often as not taken up for the convenience of the moment, but doubtless he shows through all his wanderings a saving common-sense and an instinctive appreciation of various merit.

Upon the very interesting topic of Dryden's habit in matters of controversy Professor Noyes makes a new suggestion (p. xxxiii). Speaking of Dryden's patient treatment of *The Rehearsal* he says:

> In the critical essays published with *The Conquest of Granada* in 1672 Dryden certainly makes no allusion to the attack on him. He even seems determined...to show generosity by returning good for evil. 'Fletcher's Don John is our [modern dramatists'] only bugbear; and yet I may affirm...that he now speaks better, and that his character is maintained with much more vigour in the fourth and fifth acts than it was by Fletcher in the three former.' This is a direct compliment to Buckingham's alteration of Fletcher's *The Chances*.

The editor's criticism of the selected plays is candid and reasonable; he points out clearly the crude opposition of sentiment and tone which separates the serious and the comic parts even of such heroic plays as *Marriage à la Mode* and *The Spanish Friar* which in the mere mechanical adjustment of the two plots show some ingenuity. And indeed it would be difficult to surpass the disconcerting candour with which Dryden himself speaks on the subject when he chooses to exert himself in the defence of his theatrical practice. His various remarks set side by side offer a fine specimen of his scruples as a critic.

This is no place for airing a private opinion, not to say a private heresy; otherwise I would say a word about the interest both intrinsic

and biographical of two pieces which on grounds very just, so far as they go, are neglected—the so-called 'heroic' play *Tyrannic Love*, upon the martyrdom of St Catharine of Alexandria, and *The State of Innocence*, Dryden's adaptation of *Paradise Lost* to the stage. *Tyrannic Love*, notwithstanding its gross offences, is not altogether such wild phantasy—I cannot consent to a milder term—as *The Conquest of Granada*. To class Maximin as a character with Almansor, though Dryden does it when it suits him, is not quite fair. But this must be for another time. It would be absurd to suggest that the present editor should or could include either piece in his selection.

Nor will proportion let me say here all that is suggested by Professor Noyes' remarks upon Dryden and the unities. They are true and clear, but in my opinion they do not lay stress enough—nor does any account of the matter that I know—upon the root of the amazing absurdities and falsehoods with which in the end the Renaissance critics try to harmonize their theories on the subject. Dryden is no better than another and forces a candid reader to ask in many places how a reasonable man came by such monstrosities. In one word it was mainly I think because they took 'imitation,' as used by Aristotle, to signify the production of an *illusory* resemblance between the scene and the supposed reality, and then struggled vainly to find a reconciliation between the practical deductions which would have followed from such a theory and those that might be drawn more or less justly from the real position of the Greek critic.

However, this and many another topic of interest, which the editor of this book suggests, we must let pass. It remains only once more to commend it for what it contains and achieves to the student and the reader.

A. W. Verrall.

Cambridge.

Homer's Odyssey: a Line-for-line Translation in the Metre of the Original. By H. B. Cotterill. With twenty-four Illustrations by Patten Wilson. London: Harrap & Co. 1911. 4to. xxiii + 335 pp.

This new translation of the *Odyssey* comes out with every advantage of stately form and artistic dress. Other translators have been content to give us their versions piecemeal; Mr Cotterill has preferred to wait till he could issue his complete. It has been a labour of love, and of years. The idea came to him long ago during explorations in Central Africa, making him wish to reproduce in English verse the 'simplicity, directness, and rapidity' of the original. He is to be congratulated on having been able to carry out his design in its entirety. As a translation his work has great merit, the difficulty of providing an equivalent for each separate line being got over with remarkable ability. 'Metre of the original' must be taken with a qualification, since accent is avowedly substituted for quantity as the primary basis of the verse, though much attention is at the same time given to quantitative values.

There is no attempt at a 'homometric' rendering, as in the case of Cayley's *Iliad*.

A preface of some twenty pages deals mainly with metre. All forms of verse involving rhyme are pronounced unsuitable for his purpose, and a brief examination of others brings him to the 'hexameter,' which is discussed from what may be called an Arnoldian point of view. Little is said about the history of the metre in English, though Sidney and Stanihurst are quoted to show the futility of quantitative verse; recent attempts by one of our chief living poets are not mentioned at all, unless included in the 'few rather grotesque and unreadable experiments' with which the name of Spedding is specially associated (p. xiii). Mr Cotterill says he does not know against what 'barbarous experiments' Tennyson's lines were directed. If he will refer to the *Cornhill Magazine* for December, 1863, where these lines first appeared, he will find a note showing clearly that the reference was to translations of the *Iliad* by Herschel and others. I confess to having but lately discovered this myself. In the absence of any explanation (for this note was not reprinted[1]) I assumed—as grammar surely entitled one to assume—that '*these* lame hexameters' meant such ones as the poet was writing, and my only doubt was to what German verse allusion was made. The note leaves all clear. Tennyson's satire was aimed at the lumbering accentual hexameters popularized by Voss, Goethe, and Schiller, and copied by Whewell, Herschel, and others; and he cast his protest into a form different from theirs, which he never used again, and ultimately pronounced 'only fit for comic verse.'

Mr Cotterill refers to some renderings from Homer which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* for 1846, but does not seem aware that the signature 'N. N. T.' denoted the last letters of their writer's names (John Gibson Lockhart), just as 'M. L.' denoted those of William Whewell, also mentioned. His averment that Lockhart's lines influenced Longfellow's choice of a metre for *Evangeline* needs confirmation, since Longfellow had used this metre several years before in *The Children of the Lord's Supper*, translated from Tegnér, and was certainly familiar with German models.

The preface repudiates the notion of there being anything un-English or unintelligible in the chosen rhythm, and cites once more as a perfect accentual hexameter the oft-quoted

How art thou fallen from Heav'n, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning!

And indeed such cadences are perfectly common in our prose and verse; a Luciferian advocate might urge that they are too common, citing in proof such other lines as

Dearest Louise, how delightful to bring young people together!

The argument is inconclusive either way, and shows merely that the cadences are there to be used, if they can be used to advantage. 'Iambic' accentual cadence is still more common in our speech, still

[1] It may now be read in the annotations to the 'Eversley' edition of the poet's works.

more fit for base as well as noble uses, but a long succession of poets has explored its capabilities, moulded it into various verse-forms, and developed these on truly English lines. The rhythmical movement which is utilised by 'hexameter' verse, on the other hand, was more sparingly handled by our earlier poets, and the particular form of it now in question has seldom been written except in imitation of a supposed ancient prototype. Its natural tendencies, its native excellences and defects, have never had free play. It has rarely if ever been written as a natural English metre, obeying only the laws of English prosody.

Mr Cotterill rightly condemns the accentualists' too frequent disregard of syllabic quantity. His ideal is summed up in the following rules (p. xv). '(1) The accents (stresses) should fall naturally and strongly on the syllables that occupy the places that the "longs" occupy in the old metre. Such a syllable should itself be, as far as possible, long, heavy, emphatic, or weighted with *meaning* when somewhat short in pronunciation. (2) The syllables occupying the places of the "shorts" should be, as far as possible, short, light, unemphatic. (3) The true spondee should be used, especially for the second and fourth feet. The trochee should be eschewed.' As a first sketch of metre, these canons are excellent, except that the third ignores the extent to which, in English verse, silent intervals may count in scansion, as does the caesural pause in that other noble line:

> God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet.

Good English verse does not depend merely on counting and weighing syllables. These rules, however, guard against many pitfalls, particularly against the fictitious stresses to which less careful writers are prone. Weak initial syllables are notably rare in this volume. The normal run of the verse is trisyllabic, varied by occasional spondees which are usually compound words such as 'broad-brow'd,' 'swift-wing'd,' 'knee-joint.' A short extract will serve as sample, taken from the beginning of Book XIII, as it is by the second twelve Books that the author wishes his metre to be judged.

> Thus did he end; and they sat all utterly silent and speechless,
> Holden as 'twere by a spell in the shadowy hall of the palace.
> Then King Alcinous outspake and in answer addressed him:
> 'Since now under the roof of my bronze-floored palace, Odysseus,
> Safe thou art come, thou'lt never, methinks, go wandering further,
> Ere to thy home thou return'st, however to hardship accustomed.
> Now to you all and to each I announce this further injunction,
> Each who is wont to partake of the glowing wine of the elders
> Here in my banqueting-hall, and to list to the song of the minstrel:
> Lo, in a polished coffer the raiment received by the stranger
> Lieth, and fair things fashioned of gold, and the rest of the presents,
> Which Phaeacian lords of the council collected together.
> Come, let us also present him a full-sized tripod and cauldron,
> Each of us; then can we later, by making collection in public,
> Win us repayment; 'tis hard when the one does favours for nothing.'

This is a specimen of ordinary narrative. The verse is rather less trisyllabic than usual. The first line is hard to scan, since neither 'end

and they' nor 'they sat all' makes a good dactyl, nor would 'sat all' be a satisfactory spondee. In the eighth line, 'glowing' is an accentual trochee. The twelfth line begins with a weak syllable for once, 'which' not being interrogative. The name Alcinous is to be pronounced *A'lcino-ús*. This license is frequently used in names like Telemachus, Eurymedon, Hermione, etc., and will puzzle English readers, while others will instinctively expect rules of quantity to be followed, and will be put out by 'Alcinoūs outspake,' 'Telemachūs addressing.' If Arete or Tydides be a molossus, they will wonder to find Aĕgisthus, and not to find Philōctētes. Apart from proper names, too, the reliance on syllable-quantity in some cases and disregard of it in others is somewhat confusing, so that after getting accustomed to real spondees one begins to ask whether 'shadowy' is a proper dactyl or 'palace' a proper trochee, and whether 'arrogant suitors,' 'savages wanton,' 'roseate-fingered' are euphonious dipodies. The contrast jars. Quantity is not so much 'counterpointed' to accent as brought into sharp collision with it. Verse that is based sometimes on quantity alone, sometimes on accent alone, will be apt to fall between the two stools. This from the merely metrical standpoint; but other aspects need consideration.

Rapid, simple, and direct—Matthew Arnold claims these qualities for Homer's verse, but adds a fourth; it is also noble. 'Never for a moment,' he says to the wouldbe translator, 'suffer yourself to forget our fourth fundamental proposition, *Homer is noble*.' Mr Cotterill seems to think that this is put too absolutely, and would have us recognise many different levels of Homeric diction (p. xvii, footnote). When the killing of a pig is described, or even the getting ready a boat for sailing, it would certainly be absurd to expect elevated language; yet, as he truly says, the description never 'sinks into banality.' And one thing may fairly be claimed from every translator of the *Odyssey*, that he shall make us feel we are reading a great poem. No translation is really faithful which does not give that impression; much inadequacy otherwise will be pardoned in one that does. Pope, with all his faults, gives it in his bravura passages; Maginn, *pace* Arnold, gives it in the best of his ballad versions; Worsley gives it in the lingering lusciousness of Spenserian stanza. How far does this new translation meet the test? Not, I think, in the passages of highest elevation, in the lines that describe the home of the gods or the Elysian land that is to receive Menelaus, in the interview between Odysseus and his mother, in the great scene where Odysseus reveals himself to the suitors. It is best in more pedestrian passages, in lines like

> Set was already the sun, and darkened was every roadway,

or in the ship *cliché*:

> Raising the pine-wood mast to its height, in the notch of the cross-bar
> Firmly they fixed it, and bracing it taut to the prow with the forestays
> Hoisted the fair white sails with the ropes tight-twisted of oxhide.

Such lines carry us pleasantly along, and the immortal story unfolds itself in them without intrusion of an alien personality. They should be

read in bulk, rather than in detached portions. A noteworthy letter by the late Alexander Macmillan, quoted near the end of the preface, shows how easily a non-classical ear accepts such verse, and would welcome 'a powerful and effective metre analogous to the hexameter and suited to the genius of the English language.' This latter we shall probably not get till some poet of the first rank takes it in hand. Longfellow, Clough, and Kingsley—not to mention lesser lights—were hardly strong enough for the task. Perhaps in Swinburne's 'Evening on the Broads' some hints and premonitions for such a freer treatment may be found. As yet, it must be confessed, we have hardly got beyond mere versifying; the bones are not clothed with flesh and blood. Even so, however, English readers take kindly enough to verse of this kind, and Mr Cotterill's translation should be acceptable to many. While hardly capable of being used as a *crib*, it keeps wonderfully close to the original, and adds no factitious graces. Whether it adequately reproduces the 'surge and thunder of the *Odyssey*' may be more open to question.

Scholarly exactness of rendering is noticeable throughout. But in III. 450, does not ὀλόλυξαν mean a solemn sacrificial cry rather than merely 'wailing'? In V, 281, regret may be felt that the 'shield' meaning of ῥινόν is discarded. In *ibid.*, 428, Odysseus is made 'suddenly forward to dart'—this when he was being carried along on a wave—but is rightly shown as clutching 'a boulder,' not 'the rock.' Surely the sense is that he hastily (ἐπεσσύμενος) grasped some outlying projection, and so escaped being dashed against the cliff; then, when torn from his hold by the receding wave, he must have dived through or under the next breaker, so as to rise (ἐξαναδύς) on its further side and swim along to the river-mouth. VIII, 124, is literally translated, but hardly seems to make sense, since 'the length of a furrow that mules might draw in a fallow' is not a definite measure of any kind; may not the reference be to mules as compared with oxen? In XII, 89, Scylla's twelve feet are merely 'waving suspended'; surely ἄωροι means more than this, though its exact signification may be doubtful. The plan of the Homeric palace (p. xxi) makes an ingenious contribution to a difficult problem by placing both the two 'thresholds' and the 'postern' at the lower end of the great hall, with a covered way on each side leading to the armoury and sleeping chambers. On this showing, Odysseus would shoot from the lower end, guarding the exit, as certainly seems probable. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why (XXIII, 88) Penelope should have gone round by the covered way instead of descending into the hall by the stairs at the upper end.

The figures in the illustrations seem hardly so successful as the landscapes, and are not always in keeping with the text. Why is the 'good old swineherd' made so youthful-looking on his first appearance? Why are the Sirens perched high on a rock, and did Homer conceive of them as winged? The Cyclops is a veritable 'man-mountain,' whom no cave could well have contained. 'The arrival at Ithaca' is finely designed, but the cliffs seem almost too imposing for reality.

The publishers deserve great credit for the way in which this sumptuous edition has been got up, and it will be strange if a cheaper popular one is not soon called for by students and general readers.

T. S. Omond.

Tunbridge Wells.

Frederick James Furnivall: A Volume of Personal Record. London: Frowde. 1911. 8vo. lxxxiv + 215 pp.

This volume is a tribute of the best kind to the memory of one who not only did work which is known to all the world in one particular department of literary scholarship, but also threw himself with characteristic energy into every kind of human interest which lay in his path, and made friends in the most diverse quarters by his ever active sympathy and his impulsive readiness to help where help was needed. The book consists of a biography by Mr John Munro, and a series of 'Memories of F. J. Furnivall' written by a number of those who knew him or were associated with him in his varied activities. Mr Munro's biography is simply and truthfully written, as its subject would have desired. He presents the picture in its entirety, and does not omit or slur over the faults which led sometimes to regrettable episodes of violence in controversy, or to ill-considered and hasty action—faults which sprang from the same impulsiveness and the same eager irrepressible spirit which lay at the root of his success.

The storms for which Furnivall was responsible in the early days of the Working Men's College illustrate, as his biographer says, 'a fact which was characteristic of Furnivall to the end, that he never succeeded in accommodating himself to the regulations and restrictions which every institution, necessarily dependent for its success upon compromise, imposes upon its members. He always succeeded best as an adventurer, proceeding by his own initiative, and unimpeded by the discretion and the reticence of more reflecting and calculating minds.' And again: 'He never understood, or attempted to understand, the quality of tact. It was a species of dishonesty. What he held to be true was to be enounced in the face of all opposition, with unfaltering directness and clarity; what he held to be false was to be denounced with Athanasian intensity and resolution.' The two sides of him are summed up at the end of Dr Henry Bradley's appreciation:

> Furnivall had faults, as we all have, and he concealed them less than most. Where he thought he saw empty pretence of knowledge, hypocrisy, or self-seeking under the mask of zeal for scholarship, he could be a bitter enemy; and his harsh judgements were not always just.....Many who knew little of him saw in him only a man of extravagant animosities and unbridled violence of expression. To me and to many others his name stands for an ardour of unselfish kindness and a laborious helpfulness to which we have known no parallel.

This book very happily exhibits the many-sided activity of its subject by the number and variety of the contributors to it, and by the different

points of view which are taken by them, all the accounts of him harmonising, however, in the impression which they give of one who threw himself into whatever work he thought worth doing with incomparable energy and enthusiasm, who was always fresh in mind and warm in heart, and who was constantly on the watch for opportunities of doing kindness. We have here memories contributed by scholars of many various countries, by literary men who were his friends, by men and women who were interested in the various kinds of social work into which he threw himself, by rowing men and sculling women, among the latter being a member of his dearly loved Hammersmith Sculling Club for Girls and Men, which above all things he desired to have kept up after his death, even by a waitress at the A.B.C. shop in New Oxford Street to which he came regularly for tea and to meet friends; and from them all combined we get a harmonious picture of one whose character was based mainly upon simplicity and enthusiasm.

Absolute unconventionality was of course one of his characteristics. 'He took me once to a matinée,' writes Miss Radford, 'and I suppose we must have forgotten to have an early enough lunch, or grown suddenly hungry in Bond Street, for down Bond Street we walked, buns in our hands, and he, the day being hot, with his hat also in his hand, and his only coat over his arm. I was at school in those days, and this attitude to Bond Street made an immense and beneficial impression upon me.' It was a dangerous thing to get him on the platform at a meeting, for you never knew what he might not say; and there are several amusing instances recorded of irrelevant outbursts on politics or theology which made chairmen very uncomfortable, though no doubt they highly amused the unregenerate among the audience.

Social barriers he simply refused to recognise, and nothing moved his anger so much as the 'snobbishness' which excluded from the status of amateur in rowing those who got their living by manual labour. Mr Propert in this book tells the story of his agitation in favour of altering the rule, and the founding in connexion with this of the National Amateur Rowing Association.

In reviewing this book it is difficult not to slide into the vein of personal reminiscence. The present writer's memories of Furnivall go back further than most of those that are recorded in this volume. My first meeting with him was some time in the earlier seventies in Henry Bradshaw's rooms at Cambridge, and it was amusing to note the contrast between the two men, Furnivall insisting that Bradshaw must and should do some piece of work which he was specially qualified to do, and Bradshaw opposing a gently humorous placidity, which was more hopeless than any refusal, and which to Furnivall, I am afraid, seemed to indicate mere senseless obstinacy. For him it was everything to get texts printed somehow, for the sake of bringing them out and making them available. Bradshaw probably was not sorry that this should be done, but he was constitutionally incapable of working in this manner himself. After this I met Furnivall only at long intervals, but in later

years I used to hear from him pretty frequently, not only on matters of scholarship, and like so many others I have to thank him for very real help and kindness.

The book before us is intended to supply a picture of the man, rather than an appreciation of his work as a scholar, and this aim it admirably accomplishes. At the same time it would ill become a writer upon it in the *Modern Language Review* to close without a word of hearty acknowledgement of Furnivall's services to English scholarship. There have been many better scholars, but none probably whose work has more effectually contributed to progress, and without the publications of the Early English Text Society the material for the Oxford Dictionary would have been grievously incomplete. It must not be forgotten, moreover, that it was Furnivall who in early days fought the battle of the Philological Society's Dictionary, and that without him it might never have come to the birth. Chaucer scholarship owes almost all its new materials to his work and influence, and the New Shakspere Society laid the foundations of almost all that we know about the metrical characteristics of the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists. It was Furnivall's merit to discern in all these cases what needed to be done, and by his energy and contagious enthusiasm to induce bodies of subscribers and of competent workers to help him to carry it through. Professor Ker says of him very justly:

> His work as a student was another example of what is fortunately not rare in England, the pursuit and the diffusion of knowledge, apart from any elaborate organization of research. Much of the best historical work in England has been done by unprofessional hands, and Furnivall worked as an independent adventurer. No doubt his work had many of the faults which are prevented in the best regulated schools, but it had always the spring and energy of a life unimpeded by routine.... Those who saw him as he drew near the end of his voyage are glad to think of him as unconquered, retaining to the last all the devotion to learning in which he had lived, and all his confidence in the regard of his friends.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

West Riding Place-Names. By F. W. Moorman. Publications of the Thoresby Society. Leeds. 1910. 8vo. lvi + 215 pp.

The number of monographs on English place-names grows apace and Dr Moorman's volume on those of the West Riding is not the least valuable or interesting of the works which have appeared. The study of place-names may be attacked from various points of view and in this respect Dr Moorman's book stands in sharp contrast to a work which appeared almost at the same time, *The Place-names of Lancashire*, by Professor Wyld and Dr Hirst. The authors of this rigidly confine themselves to the philological aspect of the study of place-names and refuse of set purpose to consider any of those questions, social, historical and mythological which are of such perennial interest to the lay mind curious as to the meaning of the names of places, and

more especially strange names of places, with which it happens to be familiar. Dr Moorman on the other hand while determining his derivations and explanations in accordance with strict philological law, does much valuable work in endeavouring to discover the human interest behind those explanations, and trying to show what was the exact meaning of a place-name as originally applied and how far that name is suitable to the particular locality. In a long and interesting preface he sums up the results obtained by his methods and shows what light they throw collectively not only on the salient facts of our past history but also on such vexed questions as the nature of the early Teutonic settlements, their organisation and their social distinctions. At times Dr Moorman's interest in the popular aspect of his study leads him to adopt a manner which is not quite worthy of his own sound scholarship, but for his work as a whole we owe him a deep debt of gratitude.

In the explanation of difficult place-names the author often errs on the side of giving too many possible alternatives. It is right not to be dogmatic when evidence is scant or conflicting, but at times unnecessary and even impossible alternative explanations are offered in cases of this kind. For example, O.N. *Ulfadalr* (p. 211) could not have given Wooldale: the alternative explanation of Sleningford as O.E. *Slegenaford* is gratuitous; the evidence of the old records, with the exception of Domesday Book, is unanimous, and Dr Moorman would himself be the first to admit that we must not coin fresh forms to explain the vagaries of Domesday Book: the second and third alternatives for Selby (p. 165) are unnecessary and do not meet the full facts of the case: the O.E. form *Hunsigesora* as an alternative explanation of Hunsingore (p. 106) is phonetically impossible: the Domesday spelling *s* for *sc* is so common that there is no need to suggest O.E. *Easttun* as an explanation of the form *Estune* = Mod. Eshton. At times these alternative explanations involve interesting questions in place-nomenclature, but they tend to confuse the immediate issues, at least to the non-philological mind.

In the Old Norse personal names, so common in the West Riding place-names, one or two points may be noticed. The O.N. cognate of O.E. *Guthlac* is *Guthleikr* not *Guthlaug* (p. 79). *Cowthorpe* and *Colton* going back to O.E. *Coletorp* and *Coletun* (pp. 49 and 52) should be derived from Norse *Koli* rather than *Kolli*: cf. O.N. *Kolathorp* now *Kultorp* in Norway itself. The old forms of Ingerthorpe would suggest O.N. *Ingríðr* rather than *Ingvarr* and it should be pointed out that the real name of the murderer of St Edmund was not *Ingvarr* or *Yngvarr* but *Ívarr*. The form *Hinguar* in the Chronicle is due to confusion between the two names. The name *Kouthmundr* (p. 50) is not recognised in Lind's Dictionary of Norse-Icelandic names.

In some few other cases one cannot agree with the etymologies suggested. The name of the river Sheaf on which Sheffield stands is much younger than the name of the town (at least it would seem so from the records) and a river with an English name is always a matter of suspicion. The name of the river is probably derived from that of the town (cf. the river Penk from Penkridge in Staffs.). Drax (p. 61) can

hardly be from O.E. *Dragas* (pl. of *Dræg*) as that would become Mod. E. Draws. In the interpretation of names it is difficult always to see how they could come to have the force given them by Dr Moorman. It is not clear how O.E. *wīc-dūn* could come to mean 'the farm on a hill' or *wīc-healh* 'a farm situated in a corner of a field': the first element must qualify the second rather than the second the first.

These criticisms do not affect the value of the book as a whole, and are only offered because it is to be hoped that it will prove a stimulus to similar work in other counties, and the conclusions arrived at in one county must always prove helpful in another. One must not conclude this notice without a word of high praise for Mr C. J. Battersby, who has furnished some very valuable additional notes and explanations, dealing more especially with names of Scandinavian origin.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie.) Von H. C. A. Carpenter. Bonn: Hanstein. 1910. 8vo. xvi + 320 pp.

This lengthy work is essentially part of a scheme instituted by the editor of the series. In dealing with the Lindisfarne Glosses investigators have been accustomed to consider separately each of the gospels, together with its accompanying preface and rubrics; but it is now thought that an exhaustive examination of all the English portions, taken as a whole, will lead to results of greater value. To render this scheme the more practical, it has been further proposed that such an investigation shall be carried out in a series of four monographs, which shall deal successively with the accented vowels, the unaccented vowels and consonants, the declensions, and the conjugations.

Dr Carpenter, whose book thus fills the third place in the scheme, is second in the field, his predecessor being W. Stolz, whose dissertation on the accented vowels appeared in 1907. This fact makes it all the more surprising that Dr Carpenter should have thought it relevant to begin with a discussion of three questions, the bearing of which on his subject (in accordance with the scheme) seems all too remote. But still more curious is it that he should have thought it worth while debating, on palaeographical grounds, the likelihood of the glosses being the work of a single author, because he has really nothing fresh to say here. His remarks consist mainly in a long extract from the well-known 'Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum,' in the reproduction of which the size of the type is responsible for some misprints; he then modestly informs us that he agrees with the results given by the authors of the Catalogue, 'ohne mich auf tiefere paläographische Kenntnisse stützen zu können,' thus leaving the question in precisely the same state as before. He then deals briefly with questions

arising out of the date of the glosses, and with the varying forms of the letter *a*. Here again there is little to command attention. Nobody requires to be told that such variations of form do not indicate any phonetic distinctions, and it was hardly necessary to invoke the aid of an eminent scholar to destroy this mare's nest.

Still dealing with preliminaries, Dr Carpenter then considers three matters, more germane to his main subject, beginning with a discussion of the many forms where final letters or syllables are either indicated by signs of contraction or else omitted altogether. Cases where the missing syllable represents an inflexion are naturally his chief concern, and he attempts to show that, in the majority of instances, the omitted ending is linguistically justifiable. The other instances he calls 'crude forms,' using a term which ought to be left to Sanskrit grammarians of the old school. All this is very slippery ground, but our author makes brave efforts to keep his balance, and he may win approval from some. But the very existence of any 'crude forms' must of necessity tell against his argument, because it proves that whoever wrote the glosses was not unfamiliar with the practice of rendering a Latin word by its English equivalent, without regard to the context. The vowels of the case-endings are next treated, although they might have been safely left to an ally, filling the second place in the scheme, who would have been in a position to look at the whole question from a necessarily wider point of view. Having quoted some of Lindelöf's remarks on the fluctuations of gender—a feature of the dialect—Dr Carpenter finally discusses, with all detail, variations exhibited by given case-endings, adding statistics. The results of the First Part are summarized on half a page (p. 97), and it is not altogether Dr Carpenter's fault if they seem disproportionate to the labour expended upon them.

This brings Dr Carpenter to his Second Part, which is an exhaustive statement of the case-forms assumed in declension by all words capable of undergoing the process, a sign being added after each form to indicate the frequency of its occurrence. The declensions are set forth after the manner usual in scientific grammars of Old English, and room has been found for the inclusion of adverbs, prepositions, and so on. In certain of the nominal declensions, the well-known irregularities and fluctuations of gender and case-forms render difficult any attempt at a rigid classification, but Dr Carpenter meets the problem fairly by taking as his standard normal Old English usage. Using this as a basis of comparison, he is able to class all differences as new formations. To each declension is prefixed a list of the words there treated, and forms from other texts are freely quoted, for the purpose of comparison. All doubtful points are fully discussed in notes, with abundant references. It is apparent that Dr Carpenter, while availing himself of the current literature, does not accept the statements of his predecessors blindly. Moreover, the lack of a treatise has obliged him to conduct his own investigations of the necessary portions of St Matthew. At all points he is able to adduce the authority of the manuscript first-hand.

For these reasons, the Second Part of the book, both as a valuable rearrangement of known facts and on account of new matter, will be found indispensable by all whom it may concern. It is doubtful, however, whether they will be content with Dr Carpenter's favourite method of explanation, which takes the form of a direct appeal to the authority of a series of reconstructed languages, beginning with Primitive Old Anglian and ending with Indo-Germanic. These tongues seem to have enjoyed a profusion of alternative forms ('Nebenformen'); wherefore the number of asterisks in the book is considerable.

A. O. Belfour.

Belfast.

Beon und Wesan: eine syntaktische Untersuchung. Von Karl Jost. (Anglistische Forschungen.) Heidelberg: Winter. 1909. 8vo. vi + 141 pp.

In this study an attempt is made to distinguish between the functions of *bēon* and *wesan* in the Old English period, and, to some extent, in Early Middle English. Emphasis is laid, at the outset, upon the principle enunciated by Behagel 'dass gleichwertige Formen von der Sprache niemals auf die Dauer beibehalten werden: entweder geht die eine der Formen unter, oder sie werden—ohne bewusste Absicht natürlich—in ihrer Bedeutung differenziert.' Other investigators, such as Grimm, Koch, Mätzner and Nader, have felt the need of a distinction, but have usually contented themselves with the generalisation, that *bēon* has future force, while *wesan* is limited to the present.

Dr Jost rightly selects two chief texts for detailed investigation, the prose *Cura Pastoralis* and *Beowulf*. Some attention is also given to other poetical texts of the Old English period, to Ælfric, and finally to early monuments of Middle English.

The important distinction between 'abstract' and 'concrete' sentences—fundamental to the investigation—is borrowed from Paul: 'Ich verstehe hier und im folgenden unter einem Konkretum immer etwas, was als real existierend gesetzt wird, an bestimmte Schranken des Raumes und der Zeit gebunden; unter einem Abstraktum einen allgemeinen Begriff, blossen Vorstellungsinhalt an sich, losgelöst von räumlicher und zeitlicher Begrenzung.' The generalisation appears at the same time to the effect that sentences with *bēon* are abstract, sentences with *wesan* concrete or concrete-abstract. But the matter cannot be so easily settled, as Dr Jost is well aware, and he at once admits that from the purely temporal point of view *bēon* often has a special future force, cf. *Beowulf*, l. 1762, etc. There follow examples of the 'concrete' e.g. l. 2539 Gebide ge on beorge...Nis þæt ower siđ; of the 'abstract' e.g. l. 2541 ne-biđ swylc earges siđ.

The *Cura Pastoralis* causes more difficulty and necessitates more careful distinctions, since *bēon* is found in both 'abstract' and 'concrete' sentences, and similarly with *wesan*. Dr Jost makes an ingenious and,

on the whole, a successful attempt to explain the apparent inconsistencies. *Bēon* is used in 'abstract' sentences particularly when the subject is a person, 'Ylfe preostas biod folces hryre': in hypothetical sentences, 'Gif donne ægder bid unwis donne is to gedencanne hwæt Crist self cuæd': and in combination with temporal adverbs, 'oft for dæs larcowes wisdome unwisum hieremonnum bid geborgen.' In 'concrete' sentences it has future, present-future, or iterative force. The various functions of *wesan* are treated equally fully.

Some difficulty occurs in connection with such an example as the following from *Orosius*, 'Þæt Estland is swyde micel, ond Þær bid swyde manig burh' along with others where Sweet renders by the present tense. Further, the forms are not equally distributed in the various dialects, while in Middle English there is a general substitution of the plural form *sind* in favour of *beod*.

Dr Jost's treatment is throughout psychological, and he shows no signs of wishing to slur over examples which make against his theory.

P. G. Thomas.

London.

The Romantic Movement in French Literature. By H. F. Stewart and A. A. Tilley. Cambridge: The University Press. 1910. 8vo. xi + 242 pp.

Depuis quelques années le Romantisme n'a pas une bonne presse. Il est vrai que la reprise, à la Comédie Française, de certains drames flamboyants de Hugo, comme *Ruy Blas* et *Marion Delorme*, a obtenu récemment un certain succès auprès du gros public, mais à part quelques exceptions (au nombre desquelles il convient de citer surtout M. Maigron) les critiques se montrent généralement hostiles, souvent même grincheux ou injustes (cf. le livre de M. Pierre Lasserre sur *Le Romantisme Français*).

Il semble pourtant bien difficile, sinon impossible, de ne pas reconnaître la valeur considérable des écrivains que le Romantisme a produits —les Hugo, les Ste Beuve, les Balzac etc. 'Et quel temps fut jamais si fertile en...génies?' Aucune époque—pas même le grand siècle—n'en a vu naître davantage ni de plus grands—ni dont l'influence ait porté plus loin.

Comment donc expliquer l'hostilité persistante des 'habiles'? Et comment réconcilier les tares de l'école et son inéluctable déchéance avec l'éclat de ses principaux représentants? Comment les œuvres peuvent-elles être durables si les principes qui les ont inspirées étaient viciés dans leurs origines? Il y aurait sans doute beaucoup à dire là-dessus. MM. Stewart et Tilley ont bien vu que 'the critics aim rather at the movement itself than at the individual writers.' Ce qui nous semble insupportable aujourd'hui, c'est tout ce que le Romantisme contenait d'anormal et de monstrueux, c'est l'hyperesthésie, l'exaspération du moi, la sensiblerie maladive, larmoyante et déclamatoire des

'privilégiés de la souffrance,' l'exhibition éhontée de leurs misères morales et physiologiques.

Tout cela est maintenant bien mort, et méritait de mourir—mais à côté de ces éléments morbides, il y a toute une partie saine, durable—humaine et éternelle comme la Vie elle-même—qu'on pourrait appeler, paradoxalement peut-être, la partie *classique* du romantisme, si l'on convient d'appeler *classique* toute œuvre qui réunit le particulier et le général, l'éphémère et le permanent. M. Deschanel a jadis publié deux volumes sur le Romantisme des classiques. Ce serait une tâche facile et intéressante d'étudier le classicisme des Romantiques, de montrer que personne n'a exprimé avec plus de splendeur verbale que Hugo, avec plus de profondeur ni d'amertume que Vigny, avec plus de voluptueuse langueur que Lamartine, les grands lieux communs qui sont à la base de toutes les littératures, parcequ'ils forment le fonds moral de l'humanité—l'amour, la nature, la mort, et cette 'angoisse métaphysique' 'qui fait frissonner l'homme en voyant l'Infini.' Pascal l'avait dit avant Musset, et plus fortement. C'est par là, par cette identité ou cette coïncidence de l'Individuel et de l'Universel, que les deux écoles se rejoignent, et que toutes deux dureront.

Les auteurs du petit volume que nous avons sous les yeux ont eu pour but de faciliter aux jeunes gens l'étude de la littérature Romantique, de ses origines, ses éléments, son évolution.

Pour cela, ils ont tiré des principaux ouvrages théoriques de l'époque un certain nombre d'extraits caractéristiques, et de valeur durable, sur des points de doctrine ou d'histoire littéraire et les ont reliés ensemble par des exposés et de courtes discussions, en anglais, de façon à former un tout homogène, à éviter le décousu qui est trop souvent le défaut capital de ce genre de publications. Beaucoup des documents qu'ils ont utilisés sont difficilement accessibles, surtout hors de France, et MM. Stewart et Tilley ont rendu un véritable service aux étudiants anglais en les mettant à leur portée sous une forme compacte et pratique.

Leur volume, malgré ses dimensions restreintes (242 pages seulement) représente des lectures étendues et un travail considérable de sélection; devant une telle abondance de matériaux, leur tâche a dû être à la fois longue et difficile, et a nécessité beaucoup de tact et de mesure. Je dois reconnaître qu'ils s'en sont fort bien acquittés, et que leur choix est admirablement fait. Tous les passages qu'ils ont imprimés étaient essentiels, et parmi ceux qu'ils ont rejetés il serait difficile d'en citer plus d'un ou deux qui conservent encore aujourd'hui leur intérêt et leur portée et dont l'omission semble regrettable.

Par exemple, j'avoue ma déception de n'avoir pas trouvé—à côté des 33 pages de *De l'Allemagne*—un seule page du *Génie du Christianisme*, pas même la théorie si originale sur les conceptions païenne et chrétienne de la nature.

La mythologie rapetissait la nature...' c'est le christianisme qui, en chassant ces petites divinités des bois et des eaux, a seul rendu au poète la liberté de représenter les déserts dans leur majesté primitive.'

Désormais, 'libres de ce troupeau de dieux ridicules qui les bornaient de toutes parts, les bois se sont remplis d'une divinité immense....'

Tout ce passage, et deux ou trois autres semblables (malgré les justes restrictions qu'ils comportent et que Fontanes formula dès l'apparition du *Génie*), me semblent contenir en germe le vague panthéisme des premiers romantiques, et à ce titre méritaient peut-être d'être cités.

J'ai regretté aussi de ne pas trouver, à côté de plusieurs passages tirés de la *Muse Française*, un seul extrait du *Globe*. Il eût pourtant été intéressant de montrer le rôle important de ce journal dans la bataille romantique. Les classiques avaient eu, au début, la bonne fortune de profiter d'un malentendu qui provenait du contraste entre les opinions politiques et les opinions littéraires. Les premiers romantiques (Lamartine, Hugo) furent révolutionnaires en littérature, mais monarchistes en politique, et catholiques en religion. Le public, au contraire, était libéral et voltairien. Il fut donc réactionnaire en littérature. Il aurait volontiers donné gain de cause aux romantiques, mais leurs doctrines politiques et religieuses, le *droit divin*, le *trône et l'autel* etc., lui répugnaient. Ce malentendu ne cessa qu'en 1824, et ce fut le *Globe* qui y mit fin. Il se montra à la fois libéral et romantique, et grâce à la fermeté et à l'unité de sa direction, il acquit très vite une grande influence sur le public comme sur les hommes de lettres, et réussit à faire comprendre aux deux partis l'inconséquence et l'incohérence de leur attitude. Tout cela est, il est vrai, indiqué à la page 59 du livre de MM. Stewart et Tilley, mais en passant, négligemment, et, me semble-t-il, d'une façon peu claire. Il y aurait eu intérêt à préciser la question, à la faire toucher du doigt, pour ainsi dire, en donnant un ou deux extraits du *Globe*. Puisque nous parlons de la bataille romantique, était-il bien nécessaire de fixer une date précise? Et, dans ce cas, n'est-ce pas reculer un peu tard que de la faire commencer en 1824? (p. viii). Ou bien faut-il attribuer quelque importance à un personnage aujourd'hui oublié, M. de St Chamans, que M. de Feletz osa comparer à Pascal, et dont le Pamphlet *l'Anti-Romantique* (1818) aurait jeté le premier cri de guerre[1]? C'est d'ailleurs un détail insignifiant, que je me contente de signaler pour mémoire. Un dernier point: les auteurs ont donné les trois dernières préfaces des *Odes et Ballades* (1824, 1826, 1828) mais ont rejeté les deux premières (juin et décembre 1822). Pourquoi? Ce ne pouvait être pour économiser de la place. Les deux ensemble ont à peine deux pages. La première contient la fameuse définition de la poésie, terminée par la phrase souvent citée: *La Poésie est tout ce qu'il y a d'intime dans tout.* Cela ne suffisait-il pas à en justifier l'inclusion?

Mais ce sont là des vétilles. Et ce serait futilité aussi que d'ergoter à propos du 'platonic attachment' de Lamartine pour Madame Charles (p. 40). Les auteurs ont préféré là-dessus l'opinion de M. Séché à celle de M. Faguet[2], et ce n'est pas moi qui les en blâmerai. L'important,

[1] Cf. P. Albert, *La littérature au XIX^e siècle*, i, p. 27.
[2] Cf. E. Faguet, *Amours d'hommes de lettres*.

c'est que leur collaboration a produit un volume intéressant, plein de faits, d'une information solide et sûre, qu'on ne saurait recommander trop chaudement à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à la littérature française, et qui sera tout simplement indispensable aux étudiants de nos universités.

H. E. Berthon.

Oxford.

Moore en France. Contribution à l'histoire de la fortune des œuvres de Thomas Moore, dans la littérature française, 1819—1830. Par Allen Burdett Thomas. Paris: Champion. 1911. 8vo. xii + 171 pp.

This thesis, which has gained its author the degree of 'Doctor of the University of Lyons' is a fair example of what a thesis ought not to be. We regret that the University of Lyons, whose teaching has hitherto been rightly regarded as both efficient and thorough, has accepted a dissertation which, in our opinion, is a futile attempt at criticism. It will be well, however, to bear in mind that a 'University Doctorate'—which should be carefully distinguished from a 'Doctorat-ès-Lettres'—is by no means an unimpeachable guarantee of the holder's scholarship; the diploma itself is not one of the necessary qualifications expected from French Lecturers and Professors, it is mostly confined to foreign graduates who have thus first-rate opportunities of improving their knowledge of the language by a well-directed course of reading, and, as has often been the case, of making noteworthy additions to the study of French Literature or Romance Philology. The value of the 'Doctorat d'Université' is altogether relative and candidates not infrequently fail to attain a high standard of merit[1].

The substance of Mr Thomas's thesis is very thin and might easily be summed up in a highly serviceable article, say, of ten pages; the author has doubtless taken great pains in collecting his information and his conscientious industry in perusing twenty-one periodicals and various other documents may be unreservedly commended; but the critical analysis of the reasons which caused Moore to be ranked by his romantic admirers immediately below Scott and Byron, is buried under a mass of undigested knowledge. The numerous facts which Mr Thomas has left to take care of themselves are placed on one and the same plane; incongruous details and irrelevant evidence point to a distinct lack of that sense of proportion which alone would have enabled the author to tell what mattered from what did not. In a work of this kind, which is apparently meant to deal with the influence of Moore's poetry on French Romanticism, it is not enough to gather together materials, which is what any of us could do; the materials

[1] It may be useful to know that 23 students are at present reading in Paris for the Doctorat-ès-Lettres and 78 for the Doctorat d'Université.

must be intelligently sifted and interpreted—and this is what the present author has not done.

The two most important chapters ('Moore and the French Literary Press,' 'Moore's influence on French literature') mainly consist of wearisome extracts and lengthy quotations from reviews and prefaces. Mr Thomas has unhappily elected the chronological method and recorded the opinions of French critics, year by year and poem by poem; in other words, the reader must needs wade through some 150 pages of indifferent writing to come to the conclusion that Moore's poems, especially *Lalla Rookh*, the *Loves of the Angels* and the *Irish Melodies*, enjoyed a brief spell of popularity which began in 1820 or thereabout and died out in the early thirties. A complete list of the articles brought out on Moore, of the French editions of his works, of contemporary translations and imitations would have told us as much; a well-drawn up appendix would have made short work of cumbersome summaries.

The author has however been occasionally obliged to resort to a less elementary method; even then his handling of facts remains clumsy and ineffective. In his first chapter, which is an exhaustive account of Moore's stays in Paris (1817, 1819–22) and of his travels in France, we hear that '*en vrai artiste* Moore visite tous les musées et toutes les églises des villes où il s'arrête' (p. 1), and that, at Lyons 'il est descendu à l'Hôtel de l'Europe' (p. 2). Whilst in the Metropolis, the Irish poet was often the guest of M^me^ la duchesse de Broglie, 'une dame bien plus célèbre' (p. 3) than his first hostess, M^me^ de Flahaut. He certainly met a great number of illustrious Frenchmen, though in most cases he has neglected to mention their names (p. 3). Moore's acquaintance with French literature must have been slight since, in an article published in the *Edinburgh Review* (what date?), 'il n'était pas à même de distinguer les grands écrivains des autres' (p. 5). The best proof is that he met Lamartine at M^me^ de Broglie's and never said anything about him. 'Lamartine, aurait-il été un de ces hommes réputés de grand talent dont il oublie les noms?' (pp. 3, 6) etc., etc. Finally, after making numerous acquaintances not only 'dans le grand monde, mais aussi parmi les acteurs, les auteurs, et les journalistes' (p. 11), Moore was given a farewell dinner by his English friends (Oct. 18, 1822) and was back in England on Nov. 18, 1823.

The irretrievable weakness of this thesis lies as well in the author's lack of critical insight as in his inadequate information. We thought that Rousseau and Bernardin de St Pierre had contributed something towards the making of Romantic diction; not so, indeed, for Chateaubriand 'est le grand initiateur en prose' (p. 27). We believed that V. Hugo's *Orientales* had been published in 1829 and Musset's *Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie* in 1830, but 'l'année 1825 semble marquer la fin de la période de popularité de cette poésie orientale' (p. 155), and the author sententiously adds 'C'est la tendance de l'âge, qui devient de plus en plus *scientifique* et positif' (p. 156 and p. 168). We had hitherto regarded Musset's *Namouna* as the firm protest of injured common sense.

Mr Thomas has studied the influence of Moore on French poets, more particularly on Vigny, Lamartine, V. Hugo and Leconte de Lisle. On the whole, we agree that Moore was, to a perhaps greater degree than Chateaubriand, Klopstock, Byron and Milton, responsible for those innumerable angels that lent their wings to early Romanticism (pp. 46, 132, 138). We agree that in *La Chute d'un Ange* 'la pensée de Lamartine ne doit rien à Moore' (p. 131). We do not know why the sound principle contained in the last statement came to be ignored in the case of Vigny[1]. We have lately heard too much about influence; we venture to hold that there is no influence whatever, that the word itself is wrongly used, as long as the recipient's thoughts remain entire and unaltered, as long, in fact, as his debt is solely one of words, images and metaphors[2]. 'Pour écrire un poème (Eloa) sur une telle donnée,' Mr Thomas writes, 'Vigny avait besoin d'une provision d'images pittoresques pour dépeindre le décor du ciel, et il lui fallait aussi des *renseignements sur les habitudes des êtres célestes*' (p. 110). Such a disastrous start inevitably led to a long list of verbal imitations (pp. 112—123 and foll.), from which we infer the one all-important thing which the author has omitted to point out and emphasize—namely, that Eloa does not owe one jot of its deeply human meaning to Moore's heavenly pageantry and literary frippery.

> Il pense qu'à la fin des temps évanouis
> Il lui faudra de même envisager son maître
> Et qu'un regard de Dieu le brisera peut-être[3].

The last line is Vigny's own, and Mr Thomas has failed to prove, as he expressly intended (p. 109), that Brunetière blunders when he 'déclare avec confiance' that '*Eloa* n'appartient certainement qu'à Vigny' (p. 109).

One more example of 'influence': Leconte de Lisle's *Nurmahal* has very little in common with Moore's[4]. 'Nous pourrions cependant remarquer que Leconte de Lisle introduit une "péri" dans son poème, Moore a beaucoup aimé les "péris"' (p. 154)[5].

The lack of space compels us to leave out minor defects such as repetitions and inconsistencies, and it will be enough to note that Mr Thomas' knowledge of French is anything but accurate and grammatical.

J. J. Champenois.

Oxford.

[1] Mr Thomas acknowledges his debt (p. 110) to Professor Baldensperger's article on 'Moore and Vigny,' published in this *Review*, in July, 1906.

[2] For a striking instance of actual influence, see Maréchal, on Lamennais and Lamartine.

[3] *Eloa*, 638 and foll., quoted as an imitation.

[4] This I take to be the meaning of 'Le *Nurmahal* de Leconte de Lisle...a très peu de ressemblance avec Moore' (*sic*).

[5] Since the author has mentioned Th. Gautier, we may refer him to *Avatar* (p. 32, Charpentier, 1891)...'Thomas Moore pourrait seul le dire en style d'amour des Anges,' and to *Jettatura* (p. 196, same vol.)...'Miss Alicia Ward, une délicieuse jeune fille, une créature céleste, un ange de Thomas Moore.'

An Introduction to the Study of Old High German. By LIONEL ARMITAGE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1911. 8vo. 264 pp.

This book is divided into two parts as follows:

Part I falls into four short sections. It treats of the Classification of the Germanic Languages, gives a survey of the Old German Literary Monuments, Paradigms of the inflection of the Verb, Noun, Adjective and Pronoun: and explains the transcription and pronunciation of O.H.G.

Part II has seven chapters which treat successively of the Indo-germanic and Primitive Germanic Consonant Systems, the development of the Primitive Germanic Consonant System, the Old High German Consonant System (the High German Sound-shift, the Germanic Consonants in O.H.G.), the Vowel System (Primitive Germanic and its Development in O.H.G.), the Verbal System, the Nominal and Pronominal System, the Numerals and Adverbs. The book concludes with a Table of Old High German Verbs, a Bibliography and Indexes.

There is no syntax, and no systematic treatment of word-formation. It will be consequently seen that the main aim of this Introduction is to give firstly a comparative account of the phonology of O.H.G. and secondly an explanation of its inflectional system on a comparative basis. The novel feature of the book lies in this rigid application of the comparative method to Old High German grammar.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of introducing the beginner thus to his subject. Students who have received most of their previous grammatical training in connection with the Classical Languages, have, when they take up a highly inflected type of language like O.H.G., a natural bias towards comparing its structure with that of Latin and Greek; and in consequence the comparative manner of treatment renders more interesting and lively the tedious process of acquiring a new vocabulary and new paradigms. On the other hand grammars like that of Braune combine the descriptive method with a classification of the phenomena which is derived from comparative grammar without further explanation, the student being assumed to possess the knowledge already which renders such explanation superfluous. In the case of the English student previous knowledge of this sort is, however, very rare, and he is at a loss to understand, for example, why there should be a declension called that of the *a*-stems, when the words it contains show to him no visible sign of the *a* on which their classification is based. I agree fully with Mr Armitage's claim (in his Preface) that grammars of the German type are unsuitable for the English student at first, and consider that he has done the latter a good turn in producing a book which presents clearly and attractively the results of comparative grammar applied to the elucidation of the framework of the O.H.G. language. It must of course be admitted that it is an open question whether in spite of its undoubted attractiveness, the comparative standpoint is finally the best for the beginner, and whether it is not really better for him to start by acquiring a purely practical

knowledge of a given dialect, learning to read it fluently before dissecting its grammatical constitution and its relationship with cognate languages. The authorities are at variance in their practice. Dr Sweet, our leading master of the comparative and historical study of English, has for example not adopted the German method in his introductory books on Old English, which are strictly descriptive, and aim at the beginner's mastering the language practically as a preliminary to further study. The comparative standpoint has indeed for the beginner the danger that he may spend a great deal of time in studying linguistic forms without gaining any firsthand acquaintance with their employment as a means of expressing thought. It has the further drawback that while it can be applied within a reasonable compass to Phonology and Accidence, this is hardly the case with regard to Syntax, and the grammars of this particular sort are in this respect usually incomplete, like Mr Armitage's Introduction. When we consider however the uninspiring nature of the major portion of what is rather over-generously termed Old High German Literature, and the consequent lack of any exterior stimulus for the student towards the practical mastery of its language, we may probably conclude that in the case of this particular dialect we are practically constrained for pedagogical reasons to adopt, in its elementary grammars at least, either the purely comparative or mixed comparative-descriptive method. It is the task of the University lecturer to ensure that the student shall not rest content with the grammar but study the texts as well.

In the main, Mr Armitage has performed the task he set himself satisfactorily. He gives a clear and readable account of the laws of sound-change which explain the O.H.G. flectional and sound system, and he has focussed on his subject a great deal of information which the English student until now has had either to do without or seek for himself with much exertion in German books and periodicals.

It is a good feature that frequent references are given to specialistic literature; this whets curiosity and encourages a critical attitude of mind, two qualities in which the English student in his devotion to 'textbooks' and examinations is apt to be deficient. But the form in which the references are given is often careless: e.g. 'cp. Heusler' is not sufficient for a beginner, especially when neither author nor work is mentioned in the bibliography. In an elementary book furthermore full titles, latest edition, and place and year of publication ought to be given for all books quoted. This is now a firmly established usage, and it would be interesting to learn why Mr Armitage has departed from it. One would like furthermore to see more 'Gründlichkeit' in the classification of the material. I miss for example the now usual division between Phonology and Accidence. And more harmony should have been established between the Contents and the Text-headings of the different subdivisions. There is so little agreement in wording and otherwise that it almost looks as if the table of contents had originated independently of the text. In consequence it is rather difficult to resist the impression that the book did not receive a very careful

revision before printing such as would have been necessary to produce a smooth and harmonious outward form. This impression is supported by other little discrepancies. For example, the table of the 'Second Sound-Shift' on p. 63 does not show that W.G. *d* was treated differently in Middle and Rhine Franconian when medial or doubled, although the fact is stated on p. 62. And there is a good deal more of a like nature. The 'Definitions' (of phonetical terms) at the beginning of Chapter I are unsatisfactory in various ways: e.g. in a book which claims to be scientific, a 'sonant' should not be defined as 'any sound capable of being pronounced alone without the aid of any other sound.' Writers of elementary books like the present would be well advised to take their 'definitions' from the 'Phonetische Vorbemerkungen' in Brugmann's *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, and to imitate that writer in giving a reference to Sievers' *Grundzüge der Phonetik*.

R. A. Williams.

Dublin.

Bibliographie der Middelnederlandsche taal- en letterkunde. Door Louis D. Petit. Tweede deel de literatuur bevattende verschenen van 1888—1910. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1910. 8vo. pp. 221.

Wer, wie der Referent, bei seinen literarischen und bibliographischen Arbeiten die unschätzbare Hilfe erfahren hat, die L. Petits erster Teil (1888) der *Bibliographie der mnl. taal- en letterkunde* gewährte, der wird—und mit ihm jeder Freund der mnl. Literatur überhaupt—das Erscheinen der Fortsetzung auf das dankbarste begrüssen. Sie verzeichnet die einschlägigen Arbeiten, wie sie in niederländischen, französischen und deutschen Zeitschriften und in selbständigen Büchern vom Jahre 1888 bis zum Oktober 1910 erschienen sind, mit bewährtem Fleiss und Umsicht.

Die Einteilung des reichen Stoffes ist die gleiche wie im ersten Teil, d. h. er scheidet sich in zwei Abschnitte: I. *Taalkunde*, die mit ihren 66 Nummern vielleicht doch etwas mager ausgefallen ist; II. *Letterkunde*; ungleich umfangreicher (700 Nummern), gliedert sich dieser Teil in vier Unterabteilungen, deren letzte: *Textuitgaven en Critiek* 127 Seiten mit 526 Nummern füllt und in sechzehn gut angeordneten Kapiteln das einschlägige Material—vollständige Texte aber auch die geringfügigsten Bruchstücke—von germanischen Sagen (III) an bis zur Volksliteratur in Prosa (XVI j) einzeichnet. In runden Klammern beigefügte Zahlen verweisen auf jene Stellen zurück, wo dieselben sprachlichen oder literarischen Fragen und Erscheinungen im ersten Teil aufgeführt wurden; öfters ist auch dort übersehenes hier nachgetragen worden.

Dem ersten Teil gegenüber ist ein neues Kapitel als *Aanhangsel* (S. 153—58) hinzugekommen: *Geschriften betreffende de beoefening en de beoefenaren der Middelnederlandsche taal- en letterkunde*, in der Hauptsache ein Verzeichnis von Lebensbeschreibungen und Nachrufen für

niederländische und einige deutsche (J. Grimm, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Zacher) Sprach- und Literaturforscher. Zudem haben diesmal die Volksbücher (neueste Ausgaben und Zusammenstellung der älteren) ausführlichere Berücksichtigung erfahren. Zwei, wie es scheint sehr seltene Stücke, *Die Historie van Broer Ruysche*, Antwerp 1597 und *Een schone...Historie van Joncker Jan wt den vergiere* (vgl. Priebsch, *Deutsche Hss. in England*, I (1896) S. 98 n° 99 u. S. 241—85), worauf K. Meyer 1893 kurz aufmerksam machte, sind Petit entgangen. Referent hofft bald in anderem Zusammenhang auf die literarische Bedeutung derselben ausführlich zurückzukommen. Auf einzelne Ungleichmässigkeiten betreffs der Aufnahmsgrenze von Übersetzungen und Bearbeitungen, sowie von Prosawerken historischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Inhalts ist schon von anderer Seite (T. W. Müller in der *Deutschen Lit. Zeitung*, 1911, n° 20 Sp. 1229—31) hingewiesen und daselbst auch die Versetzung der 'Realien' behandelnden n° 1417—19 unter den Abschnitt *Bloemlezingen* beanstandet worden; sie hätten vielleicht eher der Abteilung II, 1 *Inleiding-Geschiedenis* angegliedert werden sollen, wo wir unter den n° 1224, 1236—37 Abhandlungen über ma. Volksglauben finden. Grosses Lob verdient das sehr ausführliche alphabetische Register (S. 165—221) vor allem wegen der Aufnahme der Initien aller kleineren *gedichten, liederen, gebeden*. Bleibt da noch ein Wunsch übrig, so wäre es der, dass unter dem Stichwort *Handschriften* der Aufbewahrungsort der im Buch angeführten in alphabetischer Folge mit Beisetzung der einschlägigen Nummern gegeben worden wäre.

Folgende Ungenauigkeiten, die mir beim Durchblättern aufgestossen sind, wären zu verbessern: N° 1703. Die Brüsseler Hs. und die (früher) in Cheltenham befindliche sind identisch; darauf hätte auch bei den N^rn^ 1683, 1704—1707 aufmerksam gemacht werden sollen. N° 1773 muss es heissen:...'Naar een Hs. in Cambridge' (st. 'Ashburnham Place') und ferner gehören die Stücke 5. *Auslegung der Bergpredigt* und 6. *Über Christi Geburt* einer anderen Cambridger Hs. an.

Dass trotz aller aufgewandten Mühe und Sorgfalt dem Verfasser einzelne Publikationen entgangen sind, darüber wird sich niemand wundern; so fehlt die für die Niederlande besonders in Betracht kommende Leipziger Dissertation (1909) W. Dolchs, *Die Verbreitung oberländischer Mystikerwerke im Niederländischen*; ferner, hinter N° 1805 einzuschalten, je ein Traktat, Spruch und Predigt Meister Eckharts in mnl. Sprache, abgedruckt in des Referenten *Deutsche Hss. in England* II, S. 80—86; eine Anzahl strophischer Reim- und Mariengebete ibid. S. 307—15; eine mnl. Mystikerhandschrift beschrieben in dieser Zs. v, 2, 178 ff.; besonders aber die in der *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* Bd. 38 (1896), S. 301—33; 436—67 und Bd. 39, S. 156—79, veröffentlichte Brüsseler Liederhandschrift II, 144. Diese unter der Fülle des Gebotenen verschwindenden Verbesserungen und Zusätze vermindern natürlich den Wert des Buches nicht, das zusammen mit seinem Vorläufer einen unentbehrlichen und verlässlichen Führer darstellt, der

gern und schnell darüber Auskunft erteilt, was Gelehrten- und Liebhaberfleiss auf mnl. Sprach- und Literaturgebiet bis auf die jüngste Gegenwart geschaffen hat.

ROBERT PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

MINOR NOTICES.

In a dissertation entitled *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Vol. VII, Philadelphia, 1910), Miss Carrie A. Harper investigates the historical and legendary materials used in the *Faerie Queene*, Book II, Canto 10, and Book III, Canto 3, where, first in the form of a narrative and then in that of a prophecy, Spenser gives an almost complete chronicle of the British kings from Brut to Cadwallader. She points out that the question of Spenser's sources here has never been properly investigated, the commentators loosely citing illustrative passages from various chronicles without determining which Spenser actually made use of, and that such an investigation as she has undertaken will be likely to throw light upon the poet's methods of work generally. After first provisionally establishing the proposition that Spenser's main basis was Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum* itself, rather than any of the later chronicles derived from it, the author proceeds to a careful and elaborate comparison of Spenser's text with this and with the later authorities, shewing that he had a very wide acquaintance with these, and selected from them freely such material as suited his purpose, especially drawing from Hardyng, Holinshed and Stow, and from the *Mirror for Magistrates*, but also occasionally from others. He shews freedom in the use of his sources, but not quite the same kind of freedom as in the case of acknowledged romances or of classical myths. That is, he treats these materials more or less with the respect that is due to history. At the same time it is to be noted that in the second portion dealing with the succession of British kings later than the time of Arthur, the poet apparently makes changes deliberately, with a view to adapting the material more fully to his purpose, and there is less evidence of a painstaking comparison of authorities. The author's theory, proposed with due caution, is that Spenser had planned and to some extent actually written a separate poem on the British chronicle history, to which the Welsh descent of Queen Elizabeth gave special interest in his eyes, and that what we have in Book II is based upon materials collected and notes made with a view to this design, while the second portion rests upon no such careful preparation. Miss Harper's dissertation follows a sound method, and seems to be written with adequate knowledge of the rather extensive literature with which it is concerned.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1911—February, 1912.

GENERAL.

Baumgartner, A., Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Ergänzungsband. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Freiburg, Herder. 12 M.

Bovet, E., Lyrisme, Épopée, Drame. Un loi de l'histoire littéraire expliquée par l'évolution générale. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Creizenach, W., Geschichte des neueren Dramas. I. Bd. 2nd ed. Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Goldstein, M., Darius, Xerxes und Artaxerxes im Drama der neueren Literaturen. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Philologie, LIV.) Leipzig, A. Deichert. 3 M.

Havers, W., Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. (Untersuchungen zur indogerm. Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, III.) Strassburg, Trübner. 11 M.

Junk, V., Gralsage und Graldichtung des Mittelalters. (Sitzungsberichte der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. CLXVIII, 4.) Vienna, Hölder. 5 Kr.

Schmeing, K., Flucht- und Werbungssagen in der Legende. (Forschungen und Funde, I.) Münster, Aschendorff. 1 M. 25.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Matzke, J. E., Memorial Volume. (Leland Stanford Junior University Publications.) Stanford University Press.

Meyer-Lübke, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 3. Lieferung. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Studi romanzi editi a cura di E. Monaci. Fasc. VII. Rome, E. Loescher. 18 L.

Latin.

Alfonsi, Petrus, Disciplina clericalis (das älteste Novellenbuch des Mittelalters), nach allen bekannten Handschriften herausg. von A. Hilka und W. Söderhjelm. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, 1.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 20.

Honorati, Vita sancti. Nach drei Handschriften herausg. von B. Munke. (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., XXXII. Beiheft.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Klapper, J., Exempla aus Handschriften des Mittelalters. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, 2.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Lehmann, P., Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Phil. des Mittelalters, IV, 1.) Munich, C. A. Beck. 10 M.

Italian.

Amaducci, P., La fonte della Divina Commedia, scoperta e descritta. 2 vols. Bologna, Beltrami. 10 L.

Bandello, M., Le novelle, a cura di G. Brognoligo. Vol. v. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXIII.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Barberino, F., I documenti d' amore secondo i manoscritti originali a cura di F. Egidi. Fasc. IX. (Società filologica romana.) Rome, E. Loescher. 4 L.

Bouchaud, P. de, Les poésies de Michel-Ange Buonarroti et de Vittoria Colonna. Essai sur la lyrique italienne du XVI^e^ siècle. Paris, Grasset. 3 fr. 50.

Busnelli, G., Il concetto e l' ordine del Paradiso dantesco : indagini e studi preceduti da una lettera di F. Flamini. Parte II. L' ordine. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, CX—CXIII.) Città di Castello, Lapi. 3 L. 20.

Castle, M. L. E., Italian Literature. London, Herbert and Daniel. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cocai, M. (Teofilo Folengo), Le maccheronee, a cura di A. Luzio. Vol. II. (Scrittori d' Italia, XIX.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Commedie del Cinquecento, a cura di I. Sanesi. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXV.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Gioberti, V., Del rinnovamento civile, a cura di F. Nicolini. Vol. III. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXIV.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Giusti, G., Poesie scelte con commento di P. Carli. (Biblioteca scolastica di classici italiani.) Florence, Sansoni. 3 L.

Gozzi, C., La Marfisa bizzarra, a cura di C. Ortiz. (Scrittori d' Italia, XXII.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Mancini, G., Vita di L. B. Alberti. 2da ediz. Florence, Carnesecchi. 15 L.

Marino, G. B., Epistolario, seguito da lettere di altri scrittori del seicento a cura di A. Borzelli e F. Nicolini. Vol. I. (Scrittori d' Italia, XX.) Bari, Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Novella, La, di Gualtieri e Griselda. Faksimile eines um 1500 in Florenz hergestellten Druckes im Besitze der kgl. Universitätsbibliothek in Erlangen. Erlangen, Mencke. 2 M.

Piccioni, L., G. Baretti prima della 'Frustra letteraria' (1719–1760). L' uomo, il poeta, il critico. (Giorn. storico della letteratura italiana. Supplemento, XIII, XIV.) Turin, E. Loescher. 13 L.

Tommasini, O., La vita e gli scritti di N. Machiavelli nella loro relazione col machiavellismo : storia ed esame critico. Vol. II. Rome, Loescher. 30 L.

Wędkiewicz, S., Materialien zu einer Syntax der italienischen Bedingungssätze. (Zeitschrift für roman. Philologie, XXXI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 50.

Spanish.

Calisto e Melibea, Comedia de. (Bibliotheca Romanica, 142—145.) Strassburg J. H. E. Heitz. 1 M. 60.

Cervantes, M. de, Don Quijote de la Mancha. Edición y notas de F. Rodriguez Marin. II. Madrid, 'La Lectura.' (Paris, Champion.)

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Colección de entremeses, loas, bailes, jácaras y mojigangas desde fines del siglo XVI á mediados del XVIII. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Espagnoles, XVII, XVIII.) Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 24 P.

Eklogen, Sieben spanische dramatische, mit einer Einleitung über die Anfänge des spanischen Dramas. Herausg. von E. Kohler. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, IX, 3.) Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Morley, S., Spanish Ballads (Romances escogidos), edited with Introduction and Notes. New York, Holt & Co.

Rodriguez Marin, F., Don Francisco de Rojas Zorilla. Noticias biográficas y bibliográficas. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos.

French.

(*a*) *Old French.*

Altfranzösische Dichtungen, Zwei: La chastelaine de Saint Gille. Du Chevalier au Barisel. Neu herausgegeben von O. Schultz-Gora. 2nd ed. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 60.

Hèyl, K., Die Theorie der Minne in den ältesten Minneromanen Frankreichs. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, IV.) Marburg, A. Ebel. 5 M. 50.

Kristian von Troyes, Wilhelm von England. Ein Abenteuerroman. Herausg. von W. Foerster. (Romanische Bibliothek, XX.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

Lancelot del Lac, Der altfranzösische Prosaroman von. 2. Branche. Les enfances Lancelot (I. Teil). Herausg. von H. Becker. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, VI.) Marburg, Ebel. 5 M.

Livre, Li quatre, des reis. Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige in einer französischen Bearbeitung des 12. Jahrh. Herausg. von E. R. Curtius. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, IX, 2.) Halle, Niemeyer. 16 M.

Paris, G., La vie de Saint Alexis, poème du XI^e^ siècle. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Remppis, M., Die Vorstellungen von Deutschland im französischen Heldenepos und Roman und ihre Quellen. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, XXXIV. Beiheft.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

(*b*) *Modern French.*

Baldensperger, F., Alfred de Vigny, contribution à sa biographie intellectuelle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Cazals, F. A. et G. Le Rouge, Les derniers jours de P. Verlaine. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Chateaubriand, F. R. de, Correspondance générale, publ. avec introduction, etc. par L. Thomas. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Collas, G., Les sentiments de l'Académie française sur la tragi-comédie du Cid, d'après le manuscrit de Chapelain. Paris, A. Picard. 2 fr. 50.

Croze, A de, La chanson populaire de l'île de Corse. Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.

Eude, R., Alfred de Vigny intime. Paris. 10 fr.

Giraud, V., Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Karénine, W., George Sand, sa vie et ses œuvres. Tome III. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

Lehmann, R., Die Formelemente des Stils von Flaubert in den Romanen und Novellen. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, v.) Marburg, Ebel. 3 M.

Longnon, H., P. de Ronsard, essai de biographie. Les ancêtres, la jeunesse. Paris, H. Champion. 8 fr.

Magne, É., Voiture et les années de gloire de l'Hôtel de Rambouillet, 1636–48. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Mélia, J., Stendhal et ses commentateurs. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Nerval, Gérard de, Correspondance (1830–55). Introduction et notes par J. Marsan. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Pauli, F., Die philosophischen Grundanschauungen in den Romanen des Abbé Prévost im Besonderen in der Manon Lescaut. (Marburger Beiträge zur roman. Philologie, vii.) Marburg, Ebel. 3 M.

Pelissier, G., Le réalisme du romantisme. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Price, W. R., The Symbolism of Voltaire's novels. (Columbia University Studies in Romance Philology and Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rochambeau, Comte de, Bibliographie des œuvres de Jean La Fontaine. Paris, A. Rouquette. 25 fr.

Rolland, J., La tragédie française au xvi^e^ siècle. Les Juifves. Paris, Sansot. 4 fr.

Sainte-Beuve, C., Lettres inédites à Ch. Labitte. Introd. et notes par G. Sangnier. Paris, Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Séché, L., Études d'histoire romantique. Les amitiés de Lamartine. i. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Strachey, G. L., Landmarks in French Literature. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s.* net.

Tedeschi, A., Ossian, 'l'Homère du Nord,' en France. Paris, H. Champion. 4 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Andersen, V., Dansk Litteratur. Forskning og Undervisning. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr. 75.

Atterbom, P. D. A., Atterboms bref till sin fästmö 1823–26. Utg. av H. Atterbom-Svenson. Stockholm, Bonnier. 5 Kr. 50.

Berge, R., Norske folkevisur av samlingane etter Sophus Bugge med visur samla og utgjevne. Christiania, Dybwad. 2 Kr. 50.

Berteval, W., Le théâtre d'Ibsen. Paris, 3 fr. 50.

Björnson, B., Aarhundredernes legende. Gjenfortalt efter V. Hugo. Med et efterord av Chr. Collin. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 2 Kr. 25.

Feilberg, H. F., Festskrift til, fra nordiske Sprog- og Folkemindeforskere. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 8 Kr.

Fröding, G., Samlade Skrifter. Minnesupplaga. ii, iii, vi. Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 1 Kr.

Holberg, L., Three Comedies translated. London, Longmans, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lamm, M., J. G. Oxenstierna. En gustaviansk natursvärmares lif och dikt. Stockholm, Geber. 6 Kr. 50.

Levertin, O., Samlade skrifter. xvii, xviii. Stockholm, Bonnier. 2 Kr. and 2 Kr. 50.

Mjöberg, J., Stilstudier i Tegnérs ungdomsdiktning. (Göteborgs högskolas Aarsskrift, i.) Göteborg, Wettergren och Kerber. 4 Kr. 25.

Noreen, A., Spridda studier. Saml. 2. Populära uppsater. Stockholm, Ljus. 3 Kr.

Rönning, F., P. M. Möller. En Levnedskildring med et Udvalg af hans Arbejder. 2. Udg. Copenhagen, Gad. 1 Kr. 75.

Rydberg, V., Skrifter. i, iii. Stockholm, Bonnier. 3 Kr. and 2 Kr. 75.

Schück H. och K. Warburg, Illustrerad svensk litteraturhistoria. 2. omarb. och utvidgade uppl. i. Stockholm, Geber. 14 Kr.

Sveriges Nationallitteratur, 1500–1900. viii (Esaias Tegnér, E. G. Geijer, utg. af O. Sylwan), xiv (1800-talets dramatik, utg. af F. Vetterlund). Stockholm, Bonnier. Each 2 Kr.

Dutch.

Dyserinck, J., A. L. G. Bosboom-Toussaint. Levens- en Karakterschets. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 2 fl. 50.

Kalff, G., Letterkunde en tooneel te Amsterdam in de 17de eeuw. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 5 fl.

Loon, H. van, Nederlandsche vertalingen naar Molière uit de 17e eeuw. The Hague, L. A. Dickhoff. 1 fl. 75.

Meerkerk, J. B., C. B. Huet. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink en Zoon. 2 fl. 50.

English.

(*a*) *Old and Middle English.*

Ewald, W., Der Humor in Chaucers Canterbury Tales. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, xlv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

Müller, A., Mittelenglische geistliche und weltliche Lyrik des 13. Jahrh. nach Motiven und Formen. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, xliv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

(*b*) *Modern English.*

Akerlund, A., On the History of the Definite Tenses in English. Lund (Cambridge, W. Heffer). 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Arnold, M. L., The Soliloquies of Shakespeare: a Study in Technic. (Columbia University Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Bergsten, N., A Study on Compound Substantives in English (Diss.). Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell. 2 Kr.

Brooke, C. F. Tucker, The Tudor Drama. A History of English National Drama to the Retirement of Shakespeare. London, Constable. 6*s.* net.

Browning, R., A Selection of Poems, 1855–64. Ed. W. T. Young. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Chatterton, T., The Rowley Poems. Reprinted from Tyrwhitt's third edition. Ed. by M. E. Hare. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s.* net.

Cleveland, J., The Poems of, Edited by J. M. Berdan. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press. (Oxford, Univ. Press.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cooper's Grammatica linguae anglicanae (1685). Herausg. von J. D. Jones. (Neudrucke frühnenenglischer Grammatiken, v.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

Courthope, W. J., The Connection between Ancient and Modern Romance. (British Academy.) London, Frowde. 1*s.* net.

Crockett, W. S., The Scott originals: an account of notables and worthies, the originals of characters in the Waverley Novels. Edinburgh, Foulis. 6*s.* net.

Delattre, F., English Fairy Poetry from the Origins to the Seventeenth Century. London, H. Frowde. (Paris, H. Didier.) 4*s.* net.

Delattre, F., R. Herrick. Contribution à l'étude de la poésie lyrique en Angleterre au xvii^e^ siècle. Paris, F. Alcan. 12 fr.

Deloney, T., Works. Edited from the earliest extant editions and broadsides by F. O. Mann. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 18*s.* net.

Dickens, Ch., as editor; being letters written by him to W. H. Wills, his sub-editor. Selected and edited by R. C. Lehmann. London, Smith Elder. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Duff, E. G., The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* net.

Dumbacher, C., Bulwers Roman 'Harold.' Eine Quellenuntersuchung. (Würzburger Beiträge zur engl. Literaturgeschichte, i.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 60.

Eimer, M., Byron und der Kosmos. Ein Beitrag zur Weltanschauung des Dichters und den Ansichten seiner Zeit. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxxiv.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 6 M. 20.

Gray, Ch. H., Lodowick Carliell. His Life, a Discussion of his Plays and 'The Deserving Favourite.' Chicago, Univ. Press (Cambridge, Univ. Press). 6*s.* net.

Hedgcock, F. A., A Cosmopolitan actor: David Garrick and his French friends. London, S. Paul. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hunt, M. L., Thomas Dekker, a Study. New York, Columbia Univ. Press (Oxford, Univ. Press). 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hurd, R., Letters on Chivalry and Romance with the third Elizabethan Dialogue. Ed. by E. J. Morley. London, Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

James I of England. New Poems from a hitherto unpublished MS. in the British Museum. Ed. by A. F. Westcott. New York, Columbia Univ. Press (Oxford, Univ. Press). 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jenkins, H., The Life of George Borrow. London, Murray. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Johnson, W. S., Thomas Carlyle, 1814–31. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lounsbury, T. R., The Early Literary Career of R. Browning. London, Fisher Unwin. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lyrical Forms in English, edited by N. Hepple. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* net.

Nessler, K., Geschichte der Ballade Chevy Chase. (Palaestra, cxii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.

Onions, C. T., A Shakespeare Glossary. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Price, W., Days with the English poets: Tennyson, Browning, Byron. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Richter, H., Geschichte der englischen Romantik. i, 2. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 12 M.

Sidney, Sir Ph., The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. Edited by A. Feuillerat. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Southern, Th., The Loyal Brother. Edited with Introduction and Notes by P. Hamelius. (Bibl. de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, xx.) Liège, Vaillant-Carmanne (Paris, H. Champion). 5 fr.

Streissle, A., Personifikation und poetische Beseelung bei Scott und Burns. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

Tennyson, Hallam, Lord, Tennyson and his Friends. London, Macmillan. 10*s.* net.

Wendt, G., Syntax des heutigen Englisch. i. Teil. Die Wortlehre. Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M. 40.

Wetz, W., Die Lebensnachrichten über Shakespeare mit dem Versuch einer Jugend- und Bildungsgeschichte des Dichters. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 4 M. 25.

Wilson, J. D., Life in Shakespeare's England. A Book of Elizabethan Prose. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wordsworth, W. and S. T. Coleridge, Lyrical Ballads, 1798. Ed. by H. Littledale. London, H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Writing Scholar's Companion, The (1695). Ed. by E. Ekwall. (Neudrucke frühnenenglischer Grammatiken, vi.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

German.

(*a*) *General (incl. language).*

Boehme, G., Neudeutsche Grammatik oder Reformdeutsch. Ein Versuch, die deutsche Sprache zu vereinfachen und zugleich weiter auszubauen. Tübingen, A. und S. Weil. 4 M. 50.

Könnecke, G., Bilderatlas zur Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur. 2. Aufl. Marburg, Elwert. 22 M.

Nadler, J., Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften. i. Die Altstämme (800–1600). Regensburg, Habbel. 8 M.

Wilmanns, W., Deutsche Grammatik. i. Abt. Lautlehre. 3. Aufl. Strassburg, Trübner. 9 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Brockstedt, G., Von mittelhochdeutschen Volksepen französischen Ursprungs. ii. Kiel, R. Cordes. 8 M.

Herold, K., Der Münchener Tristan. Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferungsgeschichte und Kritik des Tristan Gottfrieds von Strassburg. (Quellen und Forschungen, cxiv.) Strassburg, Trübner. 3 M.

Hübner, A., Daniel, ein Deutschordensdichtung. (Palaestra, ci.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M.

Matthias, W., Die geographische Nomenclatur Italiens im altdeutschen Schrifttum. Leipzig, Brandstetter. 4 M.

Ostendorf, F., Überlieferung und Quelle der Reinoldlegende. (Forschungen und Funde, iii.) Münster, Aschendorff. 2 M.

Pfannmüller, L., Die vier Redaktionen der Heidin. (Palaestra, cviii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 14 M.

Schroeder, C., Der deutsche Facetus. (Palaestra, lxxxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 8 M. 60.

Schulte, K., Das Verhältnis von Notkers Nuptiae philologiae et Mercurii zum Kommentar des Remigius Antissiodorensis. (Forschungen und Funde, III, 2.) Münster, Aschendorff. 3 M.

Way, A. S., The Lay of the Nibelung Men. Translated from the Old German Text. Cambridge, University Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Aubert, A., Runge og Romantikken. Et Livsfragment fra den tyske Romantiks Blomstring. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 10 Kr.

Becker, C., A. G. Kästners Epigramme. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren Literatur, IV.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

Berger, K., Theodor Körner. Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 5 M.

Bode, W., Der fröhliche Goethe. Berlin, E. S. Mittler. 3 M.

Borchardt, H. H., A. Tscherning. Ein Beitrag zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte des 17. Jahrh. Munich, Hans Sachs-Verlag. 10 M.

Bräuning-Oktavio, H., Beiträge zur Geschichte und Frage nach den Mitarbeitern der 'Frankfurter gelehrten Anzeigen' vom Jahre 1772. Darmstadt, Vogelsberger. 3 M. 50.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. XIII, XIV. Munich, G. Müller. Each 6 M.

Crawford, M. C., Goethe and his Women friends. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Eckermann, J. P., Beiträge zur Poesie mit besonderer Hinweisung auf Goethe. (Goethe-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. 3 M.

Falk, J., Goethe, aus näherem persönlichen Umgange dargestellt. (Goethe-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. 3 M.

Frank, R., Wie der Faust entstand. Urkunde, Sage und Dichtung. Berlin, Verlag Neues Leben. 3 M.

Geitel, M., Entlegene Spuren Goethes. Goethes Beziehungen zu der Mathematik, Physik, Chemie. Munich, Oldenbourg. 6 M.

Goethe, Der junge. Neue Ausgabe von M. Morris. VI. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

Gotthelf, J. (A. Bitzius), Sämtliche Werke, herausg. von R. Hunziker. VII. Munich, E. Rentsch. 5 M.

Hagenbring, P., Goethes Götz von Berlichingen. Erläuterung und literarhistorische Würdigung. I. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, IX.) Halle, Niemeyer, 2 M. 80.

Halm, H., Volkstümliche Dichtung im 17. Jahrh. I. M. Abele. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XL.) Weimar, Duncker. 5 M.

Hartmann, J., Das Verhältnis von Hans Sachs zur sogenannten Steinhöwelschen Decameronübersetzung. (Acta Germanica, II.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 20.

Heinse, J. J. W., Briefe aus der Düsseldörfer Gemäldegallerie, 1776–77. Mit einer Skizze der deutschen Geniezeit. (Textausgaben und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Ästhetik, I.) Vienna, E. Schmid. 6 Kr.

Hoffmann, C., Deutsche Lyrik aus Österreich seit Grillparzer. Berlin, Meyer und Jessen. 4 M.

Klettenberg, S. K. von, Bekenntnisse, Schriften und Briefe, herausg. von H. Funck. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M.

Kolitz, K., J. C. Hallmanns Dramen. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Kühn, P., Die Frauen um Goethe. Weimarer Interieurs, II. Leipzig, Klinkhardt und Biermann. 5 M.

Kühn, W., H. von Kleist und das deutsche Theater. Munich, Hans Sachs-Verlag. 2 M. 50.

Lichtenberger, H., Novalis. (Les grands écrivains étrangers.) Paris, Bloud et Cie. 2 fr. 50.

Liliencron, D. von, Neue Kunde von. Des Dichters Briefe an seinen ersten Verleger herausg. von H. Spiero. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 3 M.

Ludwig, A., Schiller. Sein Leben und Schaffen. Dem deutschen Volke erzählt. Berlin, Ullstein. 6 M.

Schaidenreisser, S., Odyssea, Augsburg, 1537. Neudruck, herausg. von F. Weidling. (Teutonia, XIII.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 5 M.

Schiller, J. F. von and J. W. von Goethe, Briefwechsel. Im Auftrage des Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs nach den Handschriften herausg. von H. G. Gräf und A. Leitzmann. 3. Bde. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M.

Schlegel, F., Briefe an Frau Christine von Stransky, geborene Freiin von Schleich. Herausg. von M. Rottmanner, II. (Schriften des literarischen Vereins in Wien.) Vienna, C. Fromme.

Schwartz, H., F. H. Jacobis 'Allwill.' (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, VIII.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

Spiess, O., Die dramatische Handlung in Lessings 'Emilia Galotti' und 'Minna von Barnhelm.' (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, VI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Storck, W. F., Goethes Faust und die bildende Kunst. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 5 M.

Sucher, P., Les sources du merveilleux chez E. T. A. Hoffmann. (Bibl. de philologie et littérature modernes.) Paris, F. Alcan. 5 fr.

Tristan und Isalde. Herausg. nach dem ältesten Druck, der 1484 bei A. Sorg in Augsburg erschien, von R. Benz. (Die deutschen Volksbücher.) Jena, Diederichs. 3 M.

Wagner, A. M. Goethe, Kleist, Hebbel und das religiöse Problem ihrer dramatischen Dichtung. Leipzig, L. Voss. 2 M. 80.

Waldhausen, A., Die Technik der Rahmenerzählung bei Gottfried Keller. (Bonner Forschungen, II.) Berlin, Grote. 3 M.

Wandrey, C., Stefan George. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 2 M.

Wieland, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. I. Abt. 7. Bd. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M.